

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



137 825

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

■

THE
DIVINE PEDIGREE OF MAN

■

THE DIVINE PEDIGREE OF MAN

OR

THE TESTIMONY OF EVOLUTION AND PSYCHOLOGY
TO THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

BY

THOMSON JAY HUDSON, LL.D.

AUTHOR OF "THE LAW OF PSYCHIC PHENOMENA," "A SCIENTIFIC
DEMONSTRATION OF THE FUTURE LIFE,"
ETC.

SEVENTH EDITION



CHICAGO
A C McCLURG & CO.

1920

■

TO MY WIFE

WITHOUT WHOSE LOVING AID, COUNSEL, AND ENCOURAGEMENT,
THIS BOOK COULD NOT HAVE
BEEN WRITTEN.

■

PREFACE.

IN attempting to fulfil a task so important, and from a layman's point of view so difficult, as that of outlining a scientific basis of Christian theism, I feel it to be due to my readers that I should state the causes which led me to undertake it, and the principles by which I have been guided in carrying it to a conclusion

It is scarcely necessary to remark that this book was not written for the benefit of those who have already found in Holy Writ sufficient evidence to convince them of the existence of an intelligent Great First Cause. Nor was it written to convince anybody of the soundness of the theory of organic evolution

It was written for the benefit of that large and constantly enlarging class of men who are imbued with the ultra-scientific dogma that nothing in either physical science or spiritual philosophy is worthy of belief if it is not confirmed by a series of well-authenticated facts, — a congeries of observable natural phenomena. This class of course includes many who are not themselves scientists, but who, having been unable to assimilate the logic of the theologian, pin their faith upon the asseverations of those scien-

tists who claim to have definitely ascertained that there is nothing in man that cannot be dragged to light by means of the surgeon's instruments or the appliances of the chemist's laboratory, or upon the reasoning of those logicians who claim to have discovered, by the process of inductive inquiry, that there is "no logical necessity" for the existence of an intelligent Deity. It was written more especially for the benefit of that large and constantly multiplying class of intelligent students who have become convinced of the substantial correctness of the general theory of organic evolution, many of whom have, at the same time, been led to adopt the atheistic conclusions reached by the great pioneers in that science. Not that all, or even the greater part, of the students of evolution have been thus led astray; for they have not. On the contrary, I think it may be safely assumed that a great majority of educated persons of all religious denominations now recognize evolution as God's method of creation. They have, indeed, not been slow to recognize the fact that the teleological argument has been immensely fortified by the simple facts of organic evolution; and they have been content to ignore the atheistic hypotheses that were at first heralded as necessary elements of the theory of evolution itself. Nevertheless, there are many earnest seekers after truth who are not thus fortified against the specious arguments of atheism, some of whom are prone to accept, at its face value, the gratuitous assumption that the atheistic hypotheses of evolutionists are as well sustained by facts as is the theory of evolution itself. It was to expose this error—this fruit-

ful source of manifold errors—and to show that the facts of evolution are susceptible of no other than a theistic interpretation, that this book was written. In other words, it was written to show that the facts of organic and mental evolution point clearly and unmistakably to a divine origin of mind and life on this earth, and that the atheistic theories of agnostic evolutionists are positively and unqualifiedly destitute of facts to sustain them.

I have, therefore, deemed it best to frame my argument upon purely scientific lines, avoiding speculative philosophy, and adhering strictly to the inductive method of investigation. To that end I have resisted the temptation to strengthen my argument by quotations from Holy Writ, although the Bible is full of pertinent passages which the Biblical scholar will not fail to recognize and apply. I have not even touched upon the teleological argument, although the teleologist will not fail to find an abundance of material for his purpose in the facts presented.

As already intimated, the facts of organic and mental evolution alone form the basis of my argument for theism, *per se*. And when I say that I have accepted those facts as they are set forth by the atheistic evolutionists, the reader will understand that I have not selected my authorities from among those who might be biased in favor of my conclusions. Also, I have accepted their arguments in favor of the general theory of organic evolution, and I have carried those arguments to their logical conclusion. In so doing I have shown that every fact and every argument that sustains the theory of

evolution also proves, with stronger reason, the divine origin of life and mind

In pursuing my investigations I have adopted the plan of going back to the very beginning of organic life on this planet in search of evidence to prove my thesis. I have done this on the theory that the nearer we approach to the source of anything the more clearly will the nature of the source be revealed in the observable phenomena. When I say that I have not been disappointed in my quest, the reader may understand that I have found in the lowest forms of animal life indubitable evidence of the divine origin of mind and life on this earth. I have also duly considered the other salient facts, phases, and stages of organic evolution, from the monera to man, with the result of finding that the uniform trend is in the same direction.

It is, however, one thing to establish the general doctrine of the divine origin of life and mind, and quite another to sustain the specific doctrine of Christian theism. The one is amply proven by the facts of organic evolution alone, the other requires the aid of psychology.

I have, therefore, given particular attention to the latter science, not only with special reference to its bearing upon Christian theism, but with regard to its bearing upon the general subject of organic evolution. Those readers who are familiar with my former works will readily understand that I refer to the new psychology, that is, to that system of psychology the fundamental principles of which were outlined in "The Law of Psychic Phenomena." In the present work I have simply carried to its legitimate conclu-

sion the fundamental hypothesis set forth in the work above mentioned. I have been moved to do so for many good and sufficient reasons, among which are : (1) The hypothesis has already been demonstrated to be capable of correlating all psychical phenomena, and explaining them on scientific principles (2) It harmonizes with all the facts of the physical sciences, including those of organic and mental evolution (3) It is the only hypothesis that furnishes a complete answer to the arguments of materialism in reference to the question of the existence of a soul in man, or of its immortality (4) And finally, it is the only psychological hypothesis yet promulgated that completely harmonizes all the facts of science with the essential doctrines of the Christian religion.

I have felt constrained, therefore, to make psychology a prominent feature of this book, and in so doing I have attempted to outline the fundamental principles which may manifest the harmony that exists between science and religion. Owing to the limitations of space in a volume like this, I have been compelled to confine myself to the specific subject of Christian theism, leaving much unsaid that bears upon the general subject of Christianity. The purpose of my undertaking will have been accomplished, however, if I have been able to point out to others a method of research which will enable them to carry forward the work that is here begun.

I have no apology to make for the faults of construction and style of this book, other than to say that it may appear that there are undue repetitions, but it will be found that these are necessary to the

continuity of the thought or argument Some of them are, perhaps, due to the fact that much of the matter has been taken from my lectures and essays on special branches of the subject here treated

T. J. H.

WASHINGTON, D C,
October 10, 1899.

CONTENTS.

Part I.

EVOLUTION AND PSYCHOLOGY.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	31

CHAPTER I.

AGNOSTICISM.

Definition of "Agnosticism" — Aggressive Ignorance — Mr Herbert Spencer's "First Principles" — His Charitable Effort to harmonize Religion and Science — His "Great Unknowable" — His Numerous "Unthinkables" — His <i>Petito Principii</i> — His Dogmatism — His Statement of Fundamental Propositions — His Lane and Impotent Conclusions — His "Basis of Reconciliation" — It is simply a Wholesale Acknowledgment of Ignorance. — It strikes at the very Root of Christian Faith — It invites Imbecile Acquiescence in Agnosticism instead of Scientific Investigation of Theism — Mr Spencer's "First Principles" Re-examined — A Legitimate Conclusion Sought for — The Conditions Requisite — The Fundamental Harmony of all Religions. — No Real Conflict between Religion and Science — It is between Science and Man-made Theological Dogmas — True Science is True Religion's Best Friend — True Science is promotive of the Highest Conceptions of, and the most Exalted Reverence for, the God of Christian Faith — Science is Promotive of all Truth — There are not two Antagonistic Orders of Truth — Truth the only Basis of Reconciliation between Religion and Science — Science furnishes the Data for the Inductive Study of Religion	42
--	----

CHAPTER II.

PSYCHOLOGY.

	PAGE
General Principles of Psychology illustrated by Facts of Evolution — "The Law of Psychic Phenomena" — Its Hypothesis sustained by Facts of Evolution — A Summary of Fundamental Principles — The Dual Mind — The Law of Suggestion — Objective and Subjective Minds differentiated — Their Powers and their Limitations — Suggestion defined — Hypnotism — Faculties of the Two Minds tabulated — An Analysis of the Objective Mind — Its one Faculty Inductive Reason — Its Defective Memory — Its Dependence upon Cultivation and Re-functioning — Its Faculties constitute Pure Intellect. — The Mind of Reason and Judgment — Its Sphere of Activity purely Mundane — It is the Product of Evolutionary Development — It perishes with the Body — The Subjective Mind — It is the Primary Intelligence — It existed Millions of Years in Animal Life before a Brain was evolved — It is the Ultimate Intelligence — Synchronic Action of the Two Minds — Genius — The Brain not the Organ of the Subjective Mind — The Dual Mind normally controlled by the Objective Mind — The Law of Suggestion its Instrument — Voluntary and Involuntary Functions — One by the Objective Mind, the Other by the Subjective — Exceptions in Deadly Peril — The Subjective Mind is fitted especially for a Higher Plane of Existence . . .	62

CHAPTER III.

PSYCHOLOGY OF MICRO-ORGANISMS

The General Theory of Evolution — Too well established to require Full Discussion — The Pedigree of Man stamped upon his Physical Organism — The Three Theories of Evolution Materialistic, Agnostic, and Theistic — Darwin, Romanes, and Haeckel accepted as Authorities for Facts, not for Theories — Facts showing Duality of Mind — The Brain not the Organ of the Subjective Mind — The Genesis of the Human Soul. — The very Lowest Form of Animal Life — The Moneron — An "Organism without Organs" endowed with a Mind — Quotations from Gates, Binet, and Others — The "Psychic Life of Micro-Organisms" — Their Habits and Mind Capacity. — Reflex Action discussed — Not Adequate to account for Phenomena — All Vital Phenomena Present in Non-Differentiated Cells — Wonderful Instincts of the *Diffugia* — Romanes on Instinct. — The Subjective Mind of Man and Animals Identical. — It is

	PAGE
the Mind that is inherited from Ancestry, Near and Remote — Instincts increase with Intelligence — Primary and Secondary Instincts — New Ones developed in Game Animals — Change of Environment develops New Dangers, hence New or Secondary Instincts — All Instincts Inheritable — Subjective Mind of Man the Sum of Ancestral Instincts — It antedated Brain by many Ages — Brain, therefore, not the Organ of Subjective Mind	74

CHAPTER IV.

EVOLUTION AND THE SUBJECTIVE MIND

The Brain not the Organ of the Subjective Mind — Proven by its Identity with the Instinctive Minds of Animals — The Latter proven by its Continuity from Lowest Organisms up to Man — Continuity proven by Comparative Analysis of Faculties and Functions — Instinct in Lower Animals Identical with Intuition in Man — Its Definition — The Deductive Faculty potentially Perfect in Subjective Minds of Animals as well as Men — The Emotions are Faculties of the Subjective Minds of Men and Animals alike — They antedated the Brain — Objective Mind is Emotionless. — Induction and Concomitant Memories, its *only Functions or Faculties*. — *Telepathy a Power of the Subjective Mind* — It exists potentially in Animals — *Telekinesis a Subjective Power* — It is the Power that enabled Jesus and Peter to walk upon the Water — It reappears in so called Spirit Phenomena — The Mysterious Motility of the Polycystids — Science cannot explain it under Physical Laws — All Subjective Powers derived from Lower Animals, beginning with the Unicellular Organisms — Further Proof by Experimental Surgery — Scientific Search for a Soul with a Scalpel — Materialistic Arguments from Cerebral Anatomy disproved. — They have searched in the Wrong Place for the Soul — The Soul is Immanent in the Body, not Inherent in it — Proofs from Voluntary and Involuntary Muscles and Functions — Time Reaction Different in the Two Minds — Phenomena when Death approaches — Subjective Mind grows Stronger as Objective Mind grows Weaker — Strongest Manifestations in the Hour of Death, after Brain has ceased to act — Death-Bed Scene when Governor Matthews passed away — The Physician's Testimony — The Wonderful Power of Suggestion then exhibited. — Proofs from Experimental Hypnotism — The Phenomena of Amnesia a Crucial Test — Spontaneous Somnambulism. — Proofs from Phenomena of Dreams 87

CHAPTER V.

EVOLUTION AND THE OBJECTIVE MIND.

	PAGE
Table showing when Brain was evolved — Rapidity of Subsequent Evolutionary Progress — Geometrical Rate of Increase — The Neptunian Strata — The Inconceivable Length of Time embraced in Organic History — Psychological Lessons taught by the Table — More than One Half the Time elapsed before a Brain appeared on this Earth — Progress Slow up to that Time — Development more Rapid in the Next Epoch, but still Slow — One Third of the Time consumed in the Age of Fishes — The Following Epoch made still more Rapid Progress, yet about One Ninth of the Time was consumed in the Reptilian Age — The Age of Mammals occupied but about One Fiftieth of the Whole Time — The Age of Man but One Two-Hundredth Part — The Historic Period occupied but an infinitesimally Small Part of One Per Cent of the Whole Time — The Significance of these Facts — The Real Function of the Brain in Organic Life — When did Animals begin to Reason? — The Brain as a Factor in Evolutionary Development — Its Inductive Powers — Its Ability to cope with an Environment of Error incident to Organic Life in the Formative Stage. — The Significance of the Intuitive Faculty — Another Plane of Existence its Apparent Realm of Activity — Some Fundamental Axioms — Secondary Instincts — The Power of Induction in Animals — Increased Rate of Progressive Development due to that Faculty	107

CHAPTER VI.

THE PROCESS OF EVOLUTION.

Objective Mind educates the Subjective Mind — Hence the Instinct of Animals is exactly proportioned to their Intelligence — Authorities cited — Progressive Mental Evolution brought about by Development of Secondary Instincts — Romanes on Primary and Secondary Instincts — The Latter brought about by "Natural Selection" — The Absurdity of that Theory illustrated — The General Theory of Natural Selection accepted with Reservations, but it is overloaded to an Absurd Degree. — Lamarck's Theory of "Appetency" also accepted with Qualifications. — The Two Theories Complementary — Further Illustration of the Absurdity of ascribing Primary Instincts to Natural Selection. — A Logical Axiom, "Never needlessly multiply Causes" — Primary and Secondary Instincts

	PAGE
defined. — They accord with the History of Organic Evolution — New Environmental Conditions reveal New Dangers. — These are at first intelligently overcome — Habit converts the Acts into Instincts which are then inherited — Natural Selection not an Original Cause of New Species — Strictly speaking, it is not a Law of Nature — “Survival of the Fittest” an Incident, not a Law — It is an Effect of other Causes — Natural Selection not the Origin of Species — Natural Selection is the Theory of Chance — It is Atheistic in its Last Analysis — Lamarck’s Theory — It is a Necessary Factor in any Complete Theory of Evolution — Structural Changes due to New Instinctive Impulses — The Latter due to Brain Development — Brain Development due to constantly Increasing Complexities of Environment — This is True of Man as of the Lower Animals — Each Individual Intelligence is the Sum of all Ancestral Instincts plus its Objective Intelligence. . .	120

CHAPTER VII.

RECAPITULATION

Instincts of the Unicellular Organism — Its Impellent Energy. — The Constant Force back of Evolution — The Law is Progress — Nature’s *Novum Organum*. — Useful Instincts a Permanent Heritage — Appetency the Effective Agency of Progressive Development — Every Mind Organism a Union of Elements of Conservation and Progress — The Immutability of Natural Law — The same Laws prevail in Organic and Mental, Moral and Spiritual Development — Primary Instincts the same in Animals and Men — The same is true of Secondary Instincts. — Instinct and Intuition Identical. — Emotions have the same Root and Origin — Religious Worship a Filial Emotion — Animal Telepathy — Telekinetic Energy — Objective and Subjective Memory differentiated — In Men as in Animals the Increasing Complexities of Environment the Spur to Progressive Development — In Men as in Animals the Bulk of Intelligence is Subjective — The Ultimate Ego is the Subjective Entity — All that is worth Preserving in the Future Life resides in the Subjective Mind . . . 149

CHAPTER VIII

THE TWO GREAT GENERIC INSTINCTS

The Simplicity of Nature’s Laws — Evolution no Exception. — Two Instincts responsible for all the Phenomena of Evolution.

	PAGE
ary Development — Self-Preservation and the Instinct of Evolution — one Conservative, the other Progressive and Creative — Natural Selection not a Law, but an Incident — Evolutionary Instinct a Constant Force — It is also Altruistic in all its Impulses — Illustrations from Every-Day Life — Fallacies of the Old Philosophies — They refer Everything to Instinct of Self-Preservation — With them all Virtue or Benevolence a Sublimated Form of Selfishness — Herbert Spencer's Philosophy of Utilitarianism — Pure Selfishness — Altruistic Acts the most Pleasurable, because in Harmony with the Strongest Instinct — Primordial Altruism — The Creative Energy Inherent in all Sentient Creatures — Human Character determined by Relative Development of the Two Instincts — Altruistic Impulses Predominant in the World — Welfare of Future Generations the Incentive — Schools, Colleges, Churches, and Eleemosynary Institutions, are Examples — Altruistic Instinct Stronger than Instinct of Self-Preservation, otherwise there could be no Progress — The most Altruistic Governments the most Progressive, and the People the most Patriotic and Brave and Warlike and Humane — Progress toward Universal Altruism Constant and Rapid — Atavistic and Degenerate Nations — Their Decadence — Central Ideas of Evolutionists and Christian Theism harmonized — The Evolutionary Instinct the Impellent Energy of Physical, Mental, Moral, and Religious Progress	159

CHAPTER IX.

EVOLUTION OF THE TWO INSTINCTS IN THE INDIVIDUAL.

Recapitulation — Man's Environment of a Moral, Social, and Spiritual Nature — Same Process of Development with Men as with Animals — Brain Mind reasons out a Line of Conduct — Habit converts it into a Permanent Characteristic — It is then an Attribute of the Subjective Mind, the Instinctive — It is then Inheritable. — The Warfare between Reason and Passion — Not for the Suppression of Passional Emotions, but for their Regulation — Reason the Judicial Tribunal. — The Sum of its Decisions constitutes the Character of the Individual. — As befits its Judicial Character, the Reasoning Mind is Emotionless — Nevertheless it ministers to Self-Interest — It decides upon what is Best for the Individual. — The Brain the *Novum Organum* of Animal Intelligence — Suggestion the Executive Agency of the Judicial Tribunal — It is the Power which invests Man with Dominion over all Animate Nature, including Himself — Intellectual Faculties

	PAGE
of Subjective Mind rarely appear above the Surface — Ex- ceptions in Genius — Emotions, however, constantly in Evi- dence — Synchronism of the Two Minds — Facts demonstrat- ing Duality of Mind — Hypnotism, Somnambulism, etc — Objective Mind not controlled by Suggestion — Subjective Mind is so controlled except in Matters of Conscience — Man not handicapped by a Preponderance of Evil in his Nature — The Strongest Instinct impels to Progress — Reason is on the Side of Right — A Ciucial Question — Why does the Mortal Mind dominate the Immortal Mind in this Life? — The Question answered — The Immortal, or Subjective, Mind was destined for a Higher Plane of Ultimate Existence — Meantime Subjective Faculties must develop on this Plane — Reason the Agency — Thus Man was made a Free Moral Agent.	177

CHAPTER X

EVOLUTION OF THE TWO INSTINCTS IN THE STATE.

The same Laws of Development prevail in States as in Individ-
uals — All Aggregations have their Origin in Intelligent Ap-
preciation of the Necessity for Mutual Protection — Reason
teaches Mutual Helpfulness and Forbearance. — Churches,
Schools, and Benevolent Institutions follow in their Order —
Altruism is intelligently practised — Habit converts it into an
Instinctive Emotion — In due Time Patriotism becomes In-
stinctive — It is developed in Proportion to Beneficence of
Institutions — Foreign War the Supreme Test of Patriotism
— Capable of Indefinite Expansion — Its Origin in Parental
Instinct — May be expanded so as to embrace all Humanity.
— Its Highest Manifestations in the most Progressive Nations
— In such Nations it approaches Universal Altruism — It be-
comes more than mere Love of Country — It becomes the
Missionary Agent of Christian Civilization — Trade and Com-
merce its Promoters — The Incentive to all Effort and all
Progress. — It is God's Method of inciting Men to Action —
Contrast with the "Gentle Savage," who neither works nor
fights. — Hunger as an Intellectual Stimulant ahke with Ani-
mals and Men — Nations must be Prosperous before they can
be Altruistic — God's Bounty from a Full Store — Accumula-
tions of Wealth cannot properly be discouraged, yet God re-
quires an Accounting

CHAPTER XI

EVOLUTION OF CONSCIENCE AND RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES.

	PAGE
Normal Control of the Subjective Mind — When Conscience becomes Instinctive — A Secondary Instinct — The Ultimate Instinctive Emotion of the Human Soul — Dominates all other Emotions — It was developed precisely the same as were all other Secondary Instincts — It was the Result of the Inductive Reasoning of the Objective Mind — Facts of Observation and Experience resulted in the Maxim, "Honesty is the Best Policy" — This is Mr. Spencer's Conscience — It culminates just where Real Conscience begins — It is the Utilitarian Conscience — It is a Step in the Process of Development, not the Process itself — It constitutes a Suggestion to the Subjective Mind — The Suggestion is accepted and deductively carried to Higher Conclusions — It is thus reinforced by every Religious Principle or Emotion — It is further assisted by Intuition — As with the Lower Animals, so with Man — Every Step in Advance is accompanied by Increased Powers of Intuitive Perception of Essential Truth — Jesus of Nazareth is an Example — The Older Prophets — Conscience, however, may be perverted — Hence the Inquisition and Religious Wars, hence Cranks — Perverted or unperverted, it is the Strongest Emotion of the Human Soul — Perverted Conscience the Exception, hence Progress toward the Higher Altruism — It is when Conscience becomes Instinctive that the Subjective Mind assumes the Ascendancy — The Suggestions of Conscience overshadow all other Suggestions. — At the Threshold of the Moral and Religious Realm the Soul asserts its Normal Supremacy	203

Part II.

PSYCHOLOGY AND CHRISTIAN THEISM.

CHAPTER I

PRELIMINARY.

Facts of Evolution to be distinguished from Theories of Evolutionists — Theistic Argument, *per se*, to be based upon Facts presented by Antitheistic Evolutionists, — Darwin, Haeckel,

	PAGE
and Romanes — Their Arguments for Evolution to be utilized as a Basis of Theistic Conclusions — Exception to be taken to Subsidiary Hypotheses — Distinction to be drawn between Theisms — Theism, <i>per se</i> , proven by Facts of Evolution — Christian Theism by Evolution and Psychology — The World interested alone in Christian Theism — Is Christian Civilization founded on Truth or Error? — The New Psychology a Necessary Factor — The Old Psychologies Inadequate to a Solution of the Problem	219

CHAPTER II.

THE GREAT ATHEISTIC PETITIO PRINCIPII.

Logical Cobwebs to be cleared away — The Real Question Is there a Personal Deity? — Anthropomorphism not Chargeable under New Psychology — The Service rendered by Evolutionists — Refuted Doctrine of Special Creations, and then said in their Hearts, "There is no God" — Mr Darwin's Great Labor directed toward Atheism — Entitled to Credit for proving Evolution — Natural Selection as the Origin of Species not sustained by Facts — Artificial Selection produces New Morphological Species, not Physiological — Examples — Huxley takes this View — Proof of Natural Selection lacking — The Theory clung to by Atheism, because it disguises the Theory that Physical Organism antedates Intelligence — This is the Stronghold of Atheism — It is assumed without Proof, which is begging the Question — Theory of Spontaneous Generation without One Fact to support it — All Known Facts against it. — Haeckel assumes it confessedly without Facts — Begs the Question — Tyndall's Experiments failed to produce Organic Life from Inorganic Matter — The Crucial Point at the Beginning of Organic Life — Natural Selection the Theory of Chance — Lamarck's Theory of Appetency — Darwin's Contempt for Lamarck because his Theory presupposed Intelligence as the Cause of Organism — "It implies Necessary Progression" — "A Wretched Book" — Darwin's Private Religious Views — Lamarck's Theory complementary to Darwin's — Huxley's Latest Views — They indorse Lamarck's Theory — Haeckel *vs* Haeckel — The Scientist *vs* the Atheist. — The Moneron demonstrates Mind as Antecedent to Physical Organism — The Monera are Structureless, and yet they are endowed with Mind and Life — A Wonderful Intelligence — His Theory itself a Case of "Spontaneous Generation." — The Moneron as a Symbol and an Example — Symbolizes the Whole Process of Evolution — An Example of Creative Power, of Control of Mind over Matter, of the

	PAGE
Immanence of the Soul in the Body — Its Independence of Organism, of a Law of Infinite Reproduction — Haeckel's Assumption begs the Question at Issue — It is in Defiance of all Facts and Recognized Principles — Atheism based upon Pure Assumption — The Theories of Darwin and his Followers are Atheistic — Their Facts are Theistic . . .	225

CHAPTER III.

THE MIND OF MAN'S EARLIEST EARTHLY ANCESTOR.

The Doctrine of Heredity — All that is inherent in Man is what he inherited from his Ancestry, Near and Remote — The Potentials of Manhood, therefore, resided in the Moneron — Propositions reduced to Syllogistic Form — The Two Primordial Instincts as shown in the Moneron — The Prepotent Agency of Physical Development and of Human Progress — A Complete Law of Evolution thus exemplified in the Monera — Thus Progress toward Highest Development follows Lines of Least Resistance — Only Good implanted in Man's Earliest Earthly Ancestor — What is Instinct? — Atheistic Theories considered — Herbert Spencer's Reflex Action — Romanes <i>vs</i> Spencer — Facts and not Phrases to be considered — Analysis of the Mental Faculties of the Moneron — Based on Haeckel's Statements — Sensation, Movement, Nutrition, Reproduction, Regeneration, Intelligence — The Promise and Potency of a Human Soul — That Intelligence comprises a Knowledge of the Primary Laws of Organic Life — Reflex Action presupposes Subjective Intelligence — It is a Recognition of Danger coupled with an Effort to avoid it — It never makes a Mistake — The Simplest Manifestation of Instinct of Self-Preservation — The Old Psychology at Fault — It knew Nothing of Subjective Mind. — All its Data from the Objective Mind — Phenomena due to Sensation being prompted by Intelligence, it follows that the same is true of the Other Faculties — Mind of the Moneron differs in no Essential from Subjective Mind of Man, except in Degree. — The same Terms define its Powers and Attributes — Nor can Faculties of the Moneron be adequately described except in Terms that define Omniscience . . .	258
---	-----

CHAPTER IV.

OTHER GODLIKE POTENTIALS IN THE MIND OF THE MONERON.

Endowed with Creative Powers — The Real "Origin of Species" — Haeckel's Admissions. — Its Development from the Undifferentiated Moneron to the Differentiated Amœba — The En-

	PAGE
ergy "from within" — The Greatest Single Step in the Process of Evolution — The Key to the Whole Mystery — The Creative Power of Mind — We must infer that all other Changes in Organism were due to the same Creative Energy — It is the Constant Force behind all Progressive Development — Huxley on the Innate Creative Powers of Animal Intelligence — The Growth and Development of the Salamandine Egg — The Power of the Water Newt to reproduce Lost Limbs — These Powers Typical Examples of Creative Energy — They are Nature's Divine Revelations — This Creative Power by Extension to Infinity would mean Omnipotence — Its Knowledge of the Essential Laws of its Being by Extension would mean Omniscience — Its Power is that of Mind over Matter — It is, then, essentially Godlike, differing only in Degree — The Tendency of Science to name Things in the Absence of an Explanation — The Popular Belief that Names do explain Things — Illustrative Examples — The Theory of the Unconscious — Hence Learned Talk of the Unconscious Acts of the Lower Animals — All the Facts of Experience show that the Subjective Mind of Man is most intensely Conscious — We have a Right to infer that the same is True of Animals — The same Laws prevail — Subjective "Unconsciousness," therefore, is Objective Ignorance of the States of Subjective Consciousness — The Same is True of our Knowledge of Consciousness of Lower Animals — Instinctive Acts are therefore presumably Conscious Acts — The Consciousness of a Godlike Mind — Whence came it? — There are but Two Hypotheses — One is Spontaneous Generation, the Other is Divine Inheritance — One is Atheism, the Other is Theism — One is without a Fact to support it, — it rests upon Pure Assumption, — a <i>Petito Principii</i> , Gross and Palpable, the Other will be discussed in the Ensuing Chapters	274

CHAPTER V.

NATURAL LAW vs "SUPERNATURAL MIRACLE"

One of the Atheistic Strongholds — Words and Phrases supposed to be Contumelious — A Method of Compelling the Acceptance of "Scientific" Absurdities — Potential Scare-Words, e g. Haeckel's "Supernatural Miracle" — His Estimate of Deific Limitations — The Question raised. — Is a Miracle Necessary to escape Spontaneous Generation? — Miracle defined — Facts of Evolution exclude Miracle — Everything happens in Regular Order, therefore not Miraculous. — To suppose Miracle to be Necessary is to prescribe

	PAGE
Limitations to Divine Intelligence — The Established Order of Nature the Antithesis of Miracle — Beginning of Life necessarily in the Established Order — Generation of Mind from Inorganic Matter would require a Miracle — We must assume Natural Law to prevail	289

CHAPTER VI.

THE ARGUMENT FROM HEREDITY

Facts drawn from the History of Organic Evolution — The Doctrine of Heredity — Its Biological Definition — The Authority of Darwin, Huxley, and Haeckel — The Common Ground upon which Atheism and Theism can stand — The Acknowledged Facts of Heredity — The Necessary Presumptions — Something to inherit — Something from which to inherit — The Character of the Inheritance — Must exist actually or potentially in the Ancestor — May differ in Degree, but not in Kind — Man inherits from his Lower Ancestry back to the Moneron — Whence the Intelligence of the Moneron? — The Law of Heredity presupposes an Ancestor — Atheism says, "This is an Exception to the General Law" — Theism replies that Laws of Nature do not admit of Exceptions — The Issue systematically examined — The Necessity of going back to the Beginning of Organic Life — (1) The Issue Spontaneous Generation or Inheritance — (2) The Facts agreed upon (a) Potentials of Manhood in the Moneron — (b) Faculties acquired only by Inheritance — (c) Antecedent Intelligence presupposed — (d) Failure of Experimental Attempts to generate Life from Inorganic Matter — (e) Monera Destitute of Structural Organism — (f) Nevertheless endowed with a Mind — (g) Developed into a Structural Organism — (h) Moneron's Mind antedated its Physical Organism — 3 What Facts support Theory of Spontaneous Generation? — Confessedly all Facts are against it — Experimental Failures — Quality of Evidence considered — Negative Evidence not the Best — But a Hypothesis without one Fact to support it is a Logical Absurdity — Hypothesis Valid only when sustained by all Facts — Otherwise no Constancy in Nature — Atheistic Hypothesis Unique — Has no Parallel in Bald, Unreasoning Assumption — Reasons for Atheist's Attitude — Doctrine of Evolution disproved Theory of Special Creations — Hence he "said in his Heart, There is no God" — Hence Necessity for inventing a Hypothesis — Paralleled only by that of Topsy. — Haeckel's Statement of the Issue — Spontaneous Generation or "Supernatural Miracle" — Equivalent to Spontaneous

	PAGE
Generation or Divine Agency — The Latter the Real Issue — No Other Possible — One is True and the Other False — Logical Conditions considered — Facts in Support of Heredi- tary Hypothesis next in Order	295

CHAPTER VII

THE ARGUMENT FROM HEREDITY (CONTINUED).

The Character of the Heritage — If essentially Divine, it is Presumptive Evidence of Divine Origin — If no other Source is Possible, the Evidence is Conclusive — No other Possible Source has been shown — Examination of Facts showing Divine Attributes in the Moneron — They are the Elementary Facts of Evolution — They demonstrate Intuitive Knowledge of Laws of its Being — Explanations on other Grounds Pure Assumptions — Begging the Question — Knowledge measured by Actions — Adaptation of Means to Ends the Test of Intelligence — Attributes summed up — Intuition — Antecedent to Organism — Has Power over Unorganized Matter — Creative Power — Creates New Species — Transmits by Inheritance — Dominant Instinct Creative — Dominant Emotion Altruistic — Potentially Divine — All Essential Attributes of the God of Christian Faith — Differing only in Degree — Knowledge, Power, Love — Whence came they? — The Question for Inductive Science — Science knows of but One Way of acquiring Faculties, — Inheritance — By Analysis of Faculties it learns the Character of Ancestry, and can predict Character of Posterity — No Exceptions to Nature's Laws — Divine Faculties necessarily a Divine Heritage — Atheistic Objections — "Supernatural Miracle" — Objection Invalid — Miracle cannot be posited on Intelligence — Natural Law always presumed — Electric Phenomena originated in Cosmic Electrical Energy — Mind originated in Cosmic Mind Energy — Atheistic Theory a Recrudescence of Fetichism — Mind in Inanimate Matter, e g — No Disrespect to Fetich Worshipper — Lodestone does not generate Magnetism — Protoplasm does not generate Mind — Each Substance is a Medium of Manifestation of a Cosmic Energy. — Can One Mind be produced from Another? — Reproduction an Example — Reproduction by Fission Demonstrative — The Monera indefinitely Divisible — Each Particle a Distinct Mind Organism — Reproduction a Mental Act — Inferences as to Divine Methods. — The Mind of each Sentient Creature a Part of the Divine Mind — Logical Rules of Investigation — The Law of Parsimony — *All violated by Atheism. — Truth does

	PAGE
not necessitate a Violation of Logical Principles — All Essential Truth may be known by Inductive Investigation — Application of Rules — Logical Axioms (1) No Effect without a Cause, (2) Cause always Commensurable with Effect — They are "Universal Postulates" — We may therefore always <i>know</i> the Nature of a Cause by observing its Effects — Nature never erects False Signals — Under this Law we <i>know</i> that the Cause of Mind is Mind — Under the Law of Heredity we know its Attributes, — that it is an Organized, Conscious Intelligence, a Personality, a Creative Intelligence, a Constant Energy, Omniscient, Omnipotent, Altruistic — No other Hypothesis accounts for All the Facts — If Nature is Constant, we know that God is our Father	310

CHAPTER VIII.

HUMAN ONTOGENY AND PHYLOGENY.

The Strongest Argument in Favor of the Evolutionary Hypothesis — The Analogical Argument from Ontogeny to Phylogeny — Haeckel's Great Work Demonstrative of its Validity — But he was in Search of Atheistic Arguments — He found None — On the Contrary, he found Proofs of Theism — General Remarks <i>in re</i> the Analogical Argument — Invalid unless the Phenomena and Laws are the Same — The Present Argument Valid — Ontogeny a Repetition of Phylogeny — Phylogeny the Cause of Ontogeny under the Law of Heredity — The Primordial Germ and the Germinal Cell Identical in Character and Attributes — The Importance of this Fact — The Later Forms of the Human Embryo correspond with the Salient Steps in Phylogeny — The Law of Heredity the Cause of the Correspondence — Evidence Comparable to that of Successive Geological Strata — Man recognizes his Earliest Earthly Ancestor by its Resemblance to the Form which marked his Earliest Embryotic Form — Haeckel's "Fundamental Law of Organic Evolution" formulated — The Debt that Science owes to Haeckel — The Pains he has taken to develop Facts that disprove his Anti-Theistic Beliefs — His Method of accounting for his Facts not so Ingenuous, or he has failed to see their Trend — His Invitation to Philosophers — His Promised Rewards to those who will explain Ontogeny phylogenetically — His own Conclusions arrived at only by ignoring his Facts — Next Chapter will explain Ontogenetic Facts phylogenetically, and carry the Analogical Argument to its Legitimate Conclusion	334
---	-----

CHAPTER IX.

THE THEISTIC ARGUMENT FROM ONTOGENY AND PHYLOGENY

PAGE

Professor Haeckel's Premises accepted for more than his Estimated Valuation — No Dispute as to Facts — The Matter in Dispute relates to Deductions from Laws agreed upon — The Invisible World not outside the Domain of Law — All Natural Forces Invisible — Deductions from Known Laws always Legitimate — Facts agreed upon by Atheists and Theists	1
1 Ontogeny repeats Phylogeny — 2 Phylogeny causes Ontogeny — 3 Heredity the Controlling Law — 4 Heredity controls Ontogeny and Phylogeny — 5 Potentialities of Manhood reside in the Germinal Cell of Man — 6 Also in the Primordial Germ — It follows that (1) the Laws are the same, (2) that Pre-existent Conditions were the same, (3) that Causes were Identical in Kind — The Ontogenetic and Phylogenetic Series begin alike with the Moneron and end in Man — Each has Identical Powers and Mental Attributes — Conditions and Causes being the same, if we find the Cause for one Condition we can safely infer the other — We know why Potentials of Manhood reside in the Germinal Cell of Man — Because they were inherited from an Antecedent Mind, — that of the Parent — Corollary The Potentialities of Manhood reside in the Moneron because they were inherited from an Antecedent Mind, — that of the Infinite Parent — No other Conclusion logically Legitimate — A Denial is a Repudiation of all Known Laws relating to it, especially that of Heredity — If Nature is constant, the Moneron inherited its Divine Potentialities from the Divine Mind — This is the Analogical Argument carried to its Legitimate Conclusion — The Analogy is Incomplete without it, and therefore Invalid — What does Atheism offer in Refutation? — Spontaneous Generation — A Theory without a Fact to support it. — An Abandonment of Induction — A Guess and a Hope that Somebody may sometime discover (or manufacture) a Fact to sustain the Atheist's Guesses — Darwin's Guess and Huxley's Hope — Haeckel's Guess without Hope — Ward's Guess and Hope — Specimens of Atheistic "Induction" — Nevertheless the World owes them much, notwithstanding a Relapse toward Fetishism, they builded better than they knew — Their Facts prove the Theory of Evolution, but they also prove the Existence of the God of Christian Faith	340

CHAPTER X.

IN THE IMAGE OF GOD.

	PAGE
The True Basis of Reconciliation of Religion and Science — Consists in a Truthful Interpretation of the Facts of Nature — There are not Two Orders of Truth, one Scientific and the other Religious — The Old Prophet's Declaration — Man was made in the Image of God — The Common Anthropomorphic Interpretation — Due to a Defective Psychology — God was conceived as an Infinite Reasoner — Otherwise an Infinite Inquirer after Facts and a Guesser at Conclusions — The Divine Likeness in the Faculties of the Subjective Mind — Even its Limitations Suggestive of Divine Attributes — The Significance of its Limitations — Its Faculties tabulated — Intuition an essentially Divine Attribute — Its Importance in the Organic World — Deductive Reasoning the Concomitant of Intuition — They, with Memory, constitute the Intellectual Faculties of the Subjective Mind — Extended by Infinity, they would be Omniscience — Inconceivable Rapidity of Subjective Mentation — Prodigious Feats of Memory, — Illustrative Cases — Dynamic Energy of the Subjective Mind — Telekinesis — Extended to Infinity, it would be Omnipotence — New Testament Examples of Dynamic Force of the Soul — Telepathy — Its Significance — Distance no Obstacle — Infinite Extension would constitute Omnipresence — A Channel of Communication between God and Man — Prayer and Inspiration — The Natural Emotions — Their Altruistic Character — Infinite Extension would mean Infinite and Universal Love — Thus the Faculties of the Soul, infinitely extended, give us an Omniscient, Omnipotent, Omnipresent God of Infinite and Universal Love — The Highest Possible Conception of Deity — The Conception not Anthropomorphic. — It neither limits nor measures God — His Qualities alone revealed — But it shows that Man was made in the Image of God — This much Man may know of God — Not that it reveals Human Attributes in God, but Divine Attributes in Man — Man's Place in Nature. — His Obligations and Duties	361

■

Part I.

EVOLUTION AND PSYCHOLOGY.

■

THE DIVINE PEDIGREE OF MAN.

Part I.

EVOLUTION AND PSYCHOLOGY.

INTRODUCTION.

IT is the boast of science that its only quest is truth, and that in its pursuit the inductive method of inquiry is never departed from. So persistently have scientists iterated and reiterated this declaration, and so abundant are the evidences that they have in the main adhered to it, that the uncritical world is wont to accept as truth whatever bears the scientific label, and as valid whatever conclusions are alleged to have been reached by the process of induction. Nor can it be denied that the constantly multiplying scientific appliances of modern civilization afford indubitable evidences of the value, not to say the infallibility, of the Baconian methods of research in the realm of physical science. The marvellous success of the inductive method of searching for truth in the material world not unnaturally gave rise to the broad declaration, by the materialistic scientists, that no theory of causation, spiritual or physical, is worthy of serious consideration unless

it be sustained by a series of well-authenticated facts that can bear no other possible interpretation. This was the prevailing idea among skeptical scientists and their followers when Darwin propounded the theory that the organic world owed its existence to progressive development and inheritance from the lower forms of animal life.

With what alacrity this theory was accepted by the skeptical scientists, and how thoroughly it was reprobated by the theological world, are matters of history. The reasons for the acceptance on the one hand and the rejection on the other were, of course, identical. The theory, if true, disproved the then prevailing theological dogma of special, miraculous creations of species in the organic world.

It was here that the first great, fundamental error was committed by both sides. On the part of the atheistic scientists it consisted in the assumption that, by disproving the doctrine of special creations, they had eliminated God from the universe, or, to use the language of Romanes, they had thereby obviated the "logical necessity for a God." On the part of the theologians the mistake consisted in accepting the conclusion as a valid deduction from the premise, thus rendering it logically necessary for them to denounce the doctrine of evolution itself. For the time being no one seemed to regard any middle ground as logically possible; and the breach between science and religion seemed wider than ever.

After a few years had elapsed, however, the most liberal-minded, intelligent, and unprejudiced of both sides began to realize that it did not necessarily

follow that, if the theory of evolution was the true explanation of organic life, it obviated the logical necessity for an intelligent Great First Cause of all things. On the contrary, as the true theory of organic evolution came to be better understood by its early enemies, and their first crude and ridiculous conceptions of it were dissipated by a knowledge of its real scope and significance, it became more and more evident that evolution is simply God's method of creation. With this clearer understanding of the subject came higher conceptions of the true nature and character of the Divine Mind than had ever before prevailed. God was seen to be a being of infinite intelligence and power, and capable of creating and governing this universe by means of his own immutable laws. In a word, the teleological argument, or the argument from evidences of intelligent design, was strongly reinforced by the facts of organic evolution. In point of fact, it was found that the teleological evidences afforded by evolution far outweigh in real significance all that were ever before adduced.

This, however, is by no means the most important part of the evidences for theism to be found in the facts of organic evolution. It is, in fact, no part of the object of this volume to press the teleological argument, although abundant facts will be developed suggestive of teleological conclusions, which the intelligent reader will draw for himself. My object is to show that the facts of organic evolution afford abundant material from which to study the subject of theism by the pure process of induction, leaving nothing to the imagination, nothing to

speculative philosophy. That is to say, I shall undertake to show that the salient facts of evolution, as developed by the researches of anti-theistic scientists, are susceptible of no other than a theistic interpretation, without an utter abandonment and repudiation of every principle of logical, scientific inductive investigation. To that end I shall undertake to prove that they have avoided a theistic interpretation of their own facts, only by abandoning, at all the crucial points in their inquiry, the plainest principles of induction, and soaring away into the cloudy realms of speculative philosophy without one fact, or semblance of a fact, to sustain their hypotheses.

I shall show, for instance, that Mr. Darwin's great principle of "natural selection," when considered as "the *origin* of species," is, in that sense, without a fact to sustain it. Natural selection, or survival of the fittest, is a potent factor in the process of organic development, and no theory of evolution could be complete without it. But it is preservative of species, — not creative. I shall sustain this view by the opinions of such scientists as Huxley, and I shall demonstrate it by facts presented by such evolutionists as Haeckel. Mr. Darwin has presented a formidable array of facts to demonstrate the correctness of his fundamental theory of organic evolution, and no unprejudiced person can deny that he has abundantly sustained that theory. He has also cited a great number of facts which he assumes to have a bearing upon his subsidiary hypothesis. Nevertheless, it is true that he has not cited one case where anything more than a *morphological* species

has been produced, either by natural or artificial selection. In this sense, therefore, his theory that natural selection is the origin of species must be relegated to the domain of speculative philosophy without facts to sustain it,—the very opposite of induction. I shall venture to infer that his strenuous insistence upon that theory may have been due to one or both of two causes. One of these was his hostility to Lamarck and his theory of “appetency” as the cause of structural changes in organic life, and the other, his desire to sustain the atheistic theory that physical organism antedates, and is the cause of, life and mind.

In reference to these questions I shall undertake to show that Lamarck's or some cognate theory is necessary in order to constitute a complete, coherent theory of organic evolution. That is to say, no theory of evolution can be complete, in the sense of accounting for all the facts, if either Lamarck or Darwin is left out. For that reason I shall go back, with Haeckel, to the beginning of organic life on this planet, and prove that mind antedates and is the cause of physical, structural organism. As these crucial facts can be demonstrated at the beginning of organic life, and are not so easily proven at any other stage of evolutionary development, I shall claim the right to hold that they are typical examples showing the cause of structural changes in physical organism at all subsequent stages of organic development. I shall lay particular stress upon the foregoing considerations because of their important bearing upon the question of the origin of life on this planet.

The latter is the great question which it is the prime object of this book to discuss. Two theories are to be considered, and each will be treated with special reference to the facts of organic evolution. The atheistic theory will first be considered, for the reason that it is more easily disposed of than the other, owing to the acknowledged absence of facts to sustain it. It constitutes, in fact, another striking illustration of the alacrity with which atheistic scientists will abandon the inductive processes of investigation whenever the facts are against them.

The atheistic theory is that life and mind originated on this earth by "spontaneous generation" from inorganic matter. That is the theory, and that is all there is of it. That is to say, its ablest advocates acknowledge that no fact has ever yet been brought to light tending to prove that such a thing is possible, on the contrary, their greatest scientists have spent years in patient and persevering efforts to cause the faintest sign of life to be generated from inorganic matter; and each one has been compelled to acknowledge his utter failure.

In a word, I shall show by these facts, with others equally significant, that not only have atheistic scientists abandoned and tacitly repudiated the inductive method at every crucial point in their investigations, but that all that there is of atheism in evolution consists of pure assumption, not only without facts to sustain the assumptions, but in direct contravention of all the facts of nature and of experimental science.

The theory of the theistic evolutionist is that evolution is God's method of creation; that life and mind on this earth had their origin in an antecedent

divine mind,—an omnipresent mind-energy,—omnipotent and omniscient, that this divine, intelligent energy operates, not in contravention of law, not by miraculous interventions, not by special creations, but in pursuance of its own immutable laws, instituted from the beginning, and that, consequently, the first mind-energy that appeared on this earth was an emanation, in the natural order of events, from the Divine Intelligence

In undertaking to establish the essential truth of this hypothesis I shall be guided solely by the acknowledged facts of organic and mental evolution. In other words, I shall adhere to the inductive method, pure and simple

In pursuing the investigation I shall again go back to the beginning of organic life, for the obvious reason that the nearer we approach to the source of anything, the more clearly will the essential nature of that source be made manifest, and for the further reason that no one else, so far as I am aware, has given adequate attention to the wonderful significance, from a theistic point of view, of the phenomena of life and mind as exhibited in the lowest form of animal life. It must suffice in this connection to say that the ingenuity of man could not devise a more complete array of evidential facts demonstrative of the divine origin of mind in protoplasm and its potentialities through evolutionary development, than is found in the monera.

Evolutionists tell us that the potentialities of manhood reside in that lowest animal organism. If man descended from that organism, the proposition is necessarily true; and I shall demonstrate its truth

by indubitable evidences that atheism has not considered. In doing so, I shall prove more clearly that the moneron derived its mind and life from God than atheists have proven that man descended from the moneron. In other words, I shall demonstrate the truth of their evolutionary hypothesis by disproving their atheistic conclusions. I shall not only prove that the potentialities of manhood reside in the moneron, but that the essential attributes of omniscience there exist in embryo. Moreover, I shall prove by their own showing that, differing only in degree, the moneron is endowed with the creative energy of omnipotence, that to that energy are due all the structural changes that mark the steps in the process of organic evolution, and that all human progressive development, from savagery to the highest possible altruistic civilization, is due to the normal development of faculties existing potentially in the moneron.

In the further argument of the question I shall not only be guided by the facts set forth by the great lights of evolutionary science, but I shall avail myself of their arguments as well. That is to say, the leading arguments employed by them to prove the theory of evolution will be carried to their logical conclusions and shown to be the strongest possible arguments in support of theism. For instance, the argument based upon the law of heredity, which is the chief corner-stone in the evolutionary edifice, when carried to its legitimate conclusion will be seen to demonstrate the logical necessity of a mind, antecedent to the moneron, possessing powers identical in kind with those actually or potentially existent in

the moneron and its descendants. Any other conclusion involves the logical necessity of presupposing a break in the line of hereditary descent, an exception to a law of nature, a godlike mind without an ancestral intelligence, an effect without an adequate cause.

Again, I shall accept their analogical argument from ontogeny, which is the history of the evolution of individual organisms, to phylogeny, which is the history of the evolution of organic tribes. Human ontogeny, being an exact repetition of all the salient features of human phylogeny, constitutes one of the most conclusive arguments in support of the theory of organic evolution. Both ontogeny and phylogeny begin with an undifferentiated cell of protoplasm, and in both cases that cell culminates in man. But if the analogy be carried to its legitimate and logically necessary conclusion, it necessitates an ancestral mind for the moneron as well as for the germinal cell of man, and for precisely the same reasons. Certainly the analogy is incomplete without it, and no scientist will deny the proposition that science has never yet discovered any process by which faculties have been acquired, either in ontogeny or phylogeny, except by inheritance. The atheistic evolutionist, therefore, cannot avoid the conclusion that the moneron inherited its powers, actual and potential, from a divine ancestry, without repudiating his own logic, ignoring his own facts, and abandoning the inductive method of scientific research. All this he deliberately does when he seeks, in the theory of spontaneous generation from inorganic chemical compounds, to account for the

divine potentialities resident in the mind of the moneron.

When these arguments are fully stated and understood, they will not only be found to establish clearly the theory of the divine origin of life and mind on this earth, but, at the same time, to confirm fully the Christian doctrine of the divine pedigree of man. Having clearly proven the latter hypothesis, I shall then venture to reverse the process of inquiry, by taking man as the basis and reasoning back to his divine origin, with a view of finding what conceptions of divine attributes are derivable from our knowledge of the faculties possessed by man. In classifying the latter I shall be guided by the principles of, and facts developed by, the new psychology. By this I mean the hypothesis of duality of mind, as set forth in my published works.¹ I shall, therefore, analyze the faculties of the subjective mind of man, as they have been revealed to the scientific world by means of experimental psychology, and show that those faculties, by simple enlargement and extension to infinity, would become the highest conceivable attributes of an omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent God of infinite and universal love, — the God of Christian hope and faith. In other words, I shall prove inductively that the soul of man is "made in the image of God." Not morphologically or anthropologically is man made in the image of his Divine Father, but psychologically. The charge of anthropomorphism will not lie against this conception of God and his attributes;

¹ "The Law of Psychic Phenomena" and "A Scientific Demonstration of the Future Life"

for the trend of the argument will be, not to show that God is infinitely human, but to prove that man is potentially divine.

In short, the conception of the Deity derivable from the facts of evolution and psychology is of *divine immanence without pantheism, and of personality without anthropomorphism*

Before proceeding to the consideration of the scientific aspects of the question, I shall devote one chapter to that phase of atheism which has been designated as "agnosticism," with a view of showing that the principles upon which the latter cult base their conclusions make a *prima facie* case in favor of the religion which they repudiate.

CHAPTER I.

AGNOSTICISM

Definition of "Agnosticism" — Aggressive Ignorance — Mr Herbert Spencer's "First Principles" — His Charitable Effort to harmonize Religion and Science — His "Great Unknowable" — His Numerous "Unthinkables" — His *Petito Principi* — His Dogmatism — His Statement of Fundamental Propositions — His Lane and Impotent Conclusions — His "Basis of Reconciliation" — It is simply a Wholesale Acknowledgment of Ignorance — It strikes at the very Root of Christian Faith — It invites Imbecile Acquiescence in Agnosticism instead of Scientific Investigation of Theism — Mr Spencer's "First Principles" Re-examined — A Legitimate Conclusion Sought for — The Conditions Requisite — The Fundamental Harmony of all Religions — No Real Conflict between Religion and Science — It is between Science and Man-made Theological Dogmas — True Science is True Religion's Best Friend — True Science is promotive of the Highest Conceptions of, and the most Exalted Reverence for, the God of Christian Faith — Science is Promotive of all Truth — There are not two Antagonistic Orders of Truth — Truth the only Basis of Reconciliation between Religion and Science — Science furnishes the Data for the Inductive Study of Religion

A GNOSTICISM is generally supposed to imply an acknowledgment of ignorance of supermundane agencies and conditions. It is apparent, however, that the agnosticism of science, as exemplified by those great scientists whose attitude in relation to current religious beliefs necessitated the coinage of a new word to express it, can be best defined as *aggressive ignorance*. An "agnostic," as exemplified by such scientists, is one who presumes to define the limits of human knowledge, and upon

those limits to erect a barrier against all further inquiry. I need no better illustration than that afforded by the writings of Mr. Herbert Spencer, who is acknowledged to be the fairest and most unprejudiced of all that great constellation of intellectual stars whose coruscations have, as never before, illuminated the path of scientific progress

Mr Spencer, in his charitable effort to harmonize science and religion,¹ undertakes to mark the boundary line between the "knowable" and the "unknowable," and to inhibit all effort, of either religion or science, to look beyond the limits thus defined. The "unknowable" is the entity which he invites religion and science to unite in worshiping, and his recipe for securing absolute harmony between the worshippers,—the soporific agent, so to speak, by means of which each is to be lulled into that somnolent condition in which distinctions are not observable and opinions are relegated to the domain of "innocuous desuetude,"—his recipe for securing harmony consists in a mutual agreement that neither of the high contracting parties shall affirm or deny anything worth mentioning in relation to the hypothetical entity that may be supposed to sustain a provisional existence on the "unknowable" side of Mr. Spencer's boundary line.

The things which he invites the united hosts of religion and science to ignore are numerous. The most of them are cherished beliefs of the most enlightened men of Christian civilization, but Mr. Spencer disposes of them all with great celerity by a method that is at once unique and effective, simple

¹ See "First Principles," Part I, "The Unknowable."

to the last degree, and easily understood and applied. It consists in the employment of a phrase that Mr. Spencer invented himself, apparently to enable him to establish his "First Principles" by a method as simple as first principles themselves usually are.

"It is unthinkable," is the polemical dynamite bomb with which he demolishes those refractory propositions which refuse to yield to the clumsy weapons of logic. And it cannot be denied that the "potential energy" of that phrase is incalculable. The rapidity with which it has gone into general use among a certain class of philosophers and scientists as a labor-saving substitute for logic and argument, shows that it supplied a long-felt want.

To do Mr. Spencer entire justice, it must be admitted that he never employs it except in cases of emergency. But in building up his "Great Unknowable," he felt compelled to employ the paradoxical method of subtraction, that is to say, he subtracted a large and varied assortment of "unthinkable" attributes from the God of Christian faith, in order to increase the magnitude of an "unthinkable" entity, — an "inconceivable abstraction," which he dogmatically designates as "The Unknowable." I employ the word "dogmatically" with deliberation, for when Mr. Spencer assumes to designate the Great First Cause as "Unknowable," he deliberately begs the question — the vital question — at issue between religion and materialistic science. If he had chosen a more modest term, as, for instance, "Unfathomable," it would have been more befitting the conservatism and caution of true science, and no one would presume to question the implied limitation of finite

intelligence. It is, in fact, not only an unwarranted assumption, — a *petitio principii*, — violative of the “first principles” of logical ratiocination, for Mr Spencer to employ the term “unknowable” as he employs it, but, as I shall presently show, the assumption is not a legitimate deduction from the fundamental premise of his argument.

In the mean time I wish to further justify my statement regarding the monumental dogmatism of agnosticism, and to show that I am justified in defining it as “aggressive ignorance.” As I have already intimated, the term “unknowable” is in itself the very quintessence of dogmatism, for it is in itself a declaration, not alone of ignorance (agnosticism), but of the impossibility of any one ever knowing anything concerning the Great Abstraction of which Mr Spencer thinks he is thinking. The most aggressive part of his dogmatism, however, is manifested when, in a mild and roundabout way, to be sure, he denounces religion as “irreligious” when it persists in believing some of his “unthinkable” propositions, and in like manner stigmatizes science as “unscientific” when it presumes to inquire beyond the boundary which separates what Mr. Spencer knows from that which he does not know. In other words, when religion persists in thinking that which Mr Spencer thinks is unthinkable, it becomes irreligious; and when science tries to find out something that Mr. Spencer thinks is unknowable, it becomes unscientific. Obviously, under the limitations of his environment, Mr. Spencer could inflict no severer punishment upon the respective recalcitrants. We have, then, the spectacle presented to us of the mildest, the gentlest,

and in many respects the greatest, of all the agnostics visiting his severest possible penalties upon those who differ with him in opinion on questions of science and religion. Torquemada could have done no more

Mr. Spencer's statement of the major premise of his argument affords a striking illustration of the axiom that the man who attempts to wage war against truth invariably places in the hands of his enemy the weapons for its defence

His proposition, in its simplest form of expression, is that "There is a soul of truth in things erroneous" This axiom he applies to the aggregate of religious beliefs, declaring that this general principle "must lead us to anticipate that the diverse forms of religious belief which have existed and still exist, have all a basis of some ultimate fact . . . To suppose," he continues, "that these multiform conceptions should be one and all *absolutely* groundless discredits too profoundly that average human intelligence from which all our individual intelligences are inherited.

"This most general reason we shall find enforced by other more special ones. To the presumption that a number of diverse beliefs of the same class have some common foundation in fact, must in this case be added a further presumption derived from the omnipresence of the beliefs Religious ideas of one kind or other are almost universal. Admitting that in many places there are tribes who have no theory of creation, no word for a deity, no propitiatory acts, no idea of another life,—admitting that only when a certain phase of intelligence is reached do the most rudimentary of such theories make their appearance,—the implication is practically the same Grant that among all races who have passed a certain

stage of intellectual development there are found vague notions concerning the origin and hidden nature of surrounding things, and there arises the inference that such notions are necessary products of progressing intelligence. Their endless variety serves but to strengthen this conclusion, showing as it does a more or less independent genesis, — showing how, in different places and times, like conditions have led to similar trains of thought, ending in analogous results. That these countless different, and yet allied, phenomena presented by all religions are accidental or factitious, is an untenable supposition. A candid examination of the evidence quite negatives the doctrine maintained by some, that creeds are priestly inventions . . . Thus the universality of religious ideas, their independent evolution among different primitive races, and their great vitality unite in showing that their source must be deep-seated instead of superficial."

Later on Mr Spencer alludes to the emotional nature of the religious sentiment as follows: —

"And if the religious sentiment displayed habitually by the majority of mankind, and occasionally aroused even in those seemingly devoid of it, must be classed among human emotions, we cannot rationally ignore it. We are bound to ask its origin and its function. Here is an attribute which, to say the least, has had an enormous influence, — which has played a conspicuous part throughout the entire past as far back as history records, and is at present the life of numerous institutions, the stimulus to perpetual controversies, and the prompter to countless daily actions. Any theory of things which takes no account of this attribute must, then, be extremely defective."

This statement of Mr Spencer's fundamental premise is seemingly as fair and candid as the exact

language of a great scientist could make it Here is a statement of a broad fact that every person of intelligence recognizes and must admit "There is a soul of truth in things erroneous." "There is truth in everything" What could be fairer? What could be more conciliatory? Nay, what could be rarer than the exhibition of such a broad and catholic spirit by a great scientist when dealing with the religious beliefs of all humanity? It serves to establish mutually pleasant relations between Mr. Spencer and his readers, to say the least It induces in the latter a state of easy confidence,—a condition of "passive receptivity," as the hypnotists say, so that they are prone to accept further "suggestions" without critical examination

Now, let us for a moment examine Mr Spencer's liberal proposition with reference to the alleged object of his essay His avowed purpose is to reconcile religion with science To that end he sets out in search of an "ultimate religious truth of the highest possible certainty,"—a truth which will not only reconcile science with religion, but "one in which religions in general are at one with each other"

This statement of his purpose, which is substantially in his own language, naturally leads one to believe that Mr Spencer has undertaken a task in the success of which every human being has the highest possible interest. It is obvious that "an ultimate religious truth of the highest possible certainty" must also be a scientific truth of equal certainty, if true religion and true science are to be reconciled But the majority of mankind will agree

that the basis of such a reconciliation, if it is to be of any possible value to mankind, must be not only an ultimate truth of the highest possible certainty, but also one of the highest possible value to science and of utility to the world at large in the regulation of human conduct

This, however, is far from the kind of reconciliation that is the object of Mr. Spencer's ambition

Now, let us briefly examine this "ultimate religious truth of the highest possible certainty,"—this potent verity that is capable of obliterating the distinctions between fetichism and Christianity, this ultimate scientific truth that is the essence alike of all religions and of all science. We have Mr. Spencer's word for it, that on the religious side it is this: "The Power which the universe manifests to us is utterly inscrutable." On the scientific side, this is the formula. "In its ultimate essence nothing can be known"

Considering first the statement of ultimate "scientific" verity, it must be admitted that it has the oracular ring of a scientific formula. Moreover, it must be conceded that it is a great fact, and a very inconvenient one, by the way, that there are very many things in this world that, to borrow the formula of Lord Dundreary, "no fellow can find out." But *that* great "ultimate truth" was not the original discovery of Mr. Spencer, albeit the pains which he has taken to demonstrate it, and to correlate it with his "ultimate religious truth" would lead one to suppose that he regarded himself as the Columbus of ultimate verity and of human limitations. It cannot be denied, however, that he was the "original

and first" discoverer of the fact that the two formulas are equivalent, nor will any one seek to rob him of the glory due to one who has been able to found a school of religious philosophy upon that assumption.

We may, therefore, concede that, in a limited sense, his scientific formula is a statement of an ultimate scientific truth. But by no stretch of liberality of construction can his so-called "ultimate religious truth" be classed even as a theological dogma, much less as an undisputed and indisputable religious truth. Like his so-called scientific truth, it is simply Mr. Spencer's oracular way of making a statement relating to the supposed limitations of human intelligence.

Moreover, when Mr. Spencer offers, as a basis of universal harmonic relations, the declaration that "the Power which the universe manifests to us is *utterly* inscrutable," he is guilty of that most heinous of all logical offences, — *begging the question*. For that is the very question at issue between the Christian religion and science — or rather between the Christian religion and such scientists as Herbert Spencer. The very essence of Christian belief in God is that man necessarily sustains a natural relationship to his Creator of a most intimate character, and that, therefore, some knowledge of the Great First Cause is not only possible, but inevitable. No Christian has ever denied the inscrutability of "the Power that the universe manifests to us," in the general sense of the term. But that it is *utterly* inscrutable is a doctrine that strikes at the very root of Christian faith, and is an utter repudiation of the life and doctrines of the Great Founder of the Chris-

tian religion And yet this is just what Mr. Spencer does when he employs the words "*utterly* inscrutable"

His attitude may be summed up in, a very few words —

He starts out professedly in search of the one great, fundamental, "ultimate religious truth" that underlies, and is the vital, constituent element of, all religions, from "fetichism to Christianity" When he finds it and presents it to an expectant world, it is seen that it is not a religious truth at all; that it is not a tenet of any religion on earth, that it is a proposition that has never been considered, either as a fundamental principle or as a constituent element of any religion whatever, but that, on the contrary, it is a proposition that strikes at the very root of every religion worthy of the name, and finally, that it is a statement that is and must be repudiated as the crassest atheism by every Christian denomination. An acceptance of it by the religious and scientific world as a basis of reconciliation, on the terms proposed by Mr. Spencer, would at once arrest all progress in the inductive investigation of the claims of Christianity, and reduce the religious world to a state of hopeless imbecility For, be it remembered, his prescription enjoins abstention from either affirmation or denial of any doctrine or belief concerning God or his attributes, and this inhibition extends alike to science and religion His sole religious creed — his recipe for reconciliation — is incarnated, so to speak, in that portentous sentence: "The Power that the universe manifests to us is *utterly* inscrutable."

And this is agnosticism.

The animus of Mr Spencer's effort must now be apparent. In searching for a formula of reconciliation he carefully avoided the statement of any proposition confirmatory of the beliefs of any religious sect or system that ever existed, and in making his selection he took care to formulate a declaration that is in absolute antagonism to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

Furthermore, while no religious sect can indorse Mr Spencer's creed, still less can it be indorsed by science. For if science stands for anything, it is for truth. It is its province to search for causes of phenomena, proximate and remote. There are doubtless, many scientists who are delighted to be able to formulate their atheistic views in Mr Spencer's terms, but there are many others whose quest is of inductive proofs of Holy Writ, — who believe that scientific methods of research will yet reveal something of the nature and attributes of the great "Power which the universe manifests to us"

It follows that Mr Spencer's great scheme for the reconciliation of religion with science has failed, and must forever fail, for the reason that an acceptance of his terms involves the total abandonment of all that either one of them stands for. Science and religion can never be reconciled upon the basis of a negative proposition that is neither religious nor scientific, especially one that is expressly repudiated by both.

Now, to put Mr. Spencer's propositions into common language, the meaning of which can be grasped by common people, they may be stated thus: —

To the religionist he says: There is just one ultimate religious truth of the highest possible certainty that you must admit before your religion can be reconciled with science, and that is that you do not know anything about religion.

To the scientist he says: There is one ultimate scientific verity that you must admit before your science can be reconciled with religion, and that is that you do not know everything about science.

It is now quite obvious why it was that Mr. Spencer's proposed Great Church of the Reconciliation was destined to prove a failure from the start. neither party could conscientiously subscribe to the creed.

Let us now re-examine the fundamental propositions with which Mr Spencer started out and see if we cannot find a legitimate conclusion. The propositions may be summed up, in Mr Spencer's words, thus: "In all religions, even the rudest, there lies hidden a fundamental verity," "common to all religions," a "religious truth," in relation to which "all religions are at one with each other," etc. As already pointed out, Mr Spencer promised to consider this fundamental truth, but carefully avoided doing so. He specifically mentioned one of the most obvious of all the fundamental truths common to all religions, — its emotional nature, — and distinctly promised to consider "its origin and its function," declaring that "any theory of things which takes no account of this attribute must, then, be extremely defective." He then dismisses that most important attribute of religion by declaring that, as to its origin, it arose by a process of evolution," and, as to its

function, it "must be adapted to the requirements of existence," adding, with confessed reluctance, "we are also forced to infer that this feeling is in some way conducive to human welfare"

It seems almost incredible that Mr Spencer should have thus summarily dismissed the consideration of an attribute of religion which, to use his own words, "has had an enormous influence — which has played a conspicuous part throughout the entire past as far back as history records, and is at present the life of numerous institutions, the stimulus of perpetual controversies, and the prompter of countless daily actions" And yet this is just what he has done, in order to give prominence to his lame and impotent conclusion which has already been discussed

Now, let us adopt Mr Spencer's fundamental, or major, premise as our own, and briefly inquire, What is that underlying truth which is common to all religions, from fetichism to Christianity? In doing so, let us employ the inductive process, and consider nothing but the well-recognized facts pertaining to the subject-matter; bearing in mind always that we are discussing the mental phenomena of religious experience, and not the limitations of human intelligence

Now, this truth, when found, if it is to possess any evidential value for any purpose whatever, must possess certain well-defined characteristics Amongst these are. —

I It must correlate all religions that have ever existed, on the well-recognized lines of religious experience.

This is the general proposition. Then, if it is to

possess any evidential value in itself as to its divine origin, or as to its natural adaptation to the requirements of existence, or its capacity to promote human welfare, it must possess certain further characteristics, namely: —

2. It must be an instinctive attribute common to all races of mankind above those of the lowest grade of human intelligence

3. It must be capable of evolutionary development without change of its essential characteristic

4. It must, in its every stage of progressive development, be more and more "conducive to human welfare."

5. It must, in its highest stage of development, be found to be the concomitant of the highest civilization.

6. It must be an attribute that, without change of its essential characteristic, develops in power, if not in intensity, and becomes more and more exalted in its manifestations with every step in the progress of science

7. And finally, it must be an attribute the implications of which cannot be disproved by scientific induction, but which, on the contrary, attain a higher and higher degree of probability the more strictly and the more directly the processes of inductive reasoning are applied to them.

Now, this attribute which correlates all religions and in which all are at one with each other, consists in the belief, with which each individual is imbued, *in a spiritual being, mightier than himself, but not indifferent to his thoughts and acts, and upon whom he feels a consciousness of dependence.*

It is obvious that this applies alike to the fetich worshipper and the Christian, together with all the intermediate grades and varieties of religious belief. The difference between religions consists in the different conceptions of the nature and attributes of the object of worship, the relations that exist between that being and man, and the emotions and practices which flow from the recognition of such relations.

Now, let us see if this underlying truth answers to the requirements above mentioned

First, then, it obviously correlates all religions (2) It must be an instinctive emotion, since it is common to all races of men above a certain grade of intelligence That there are tribes of savages so low in the scale of being that they have no idea of a deity or of a future life, simply goes to prove that religion is an inevitable outgrowth of progressing intelligence (3) That it is capable of evolutionary development, and (4) that in its every higher stage of manifestation it is more and more conducive to human welfare, is shown by the fact that (5) in its highest stage of development it is the inseparable accompaniment of the world's highest civilization.

6 The history of the great conflict between science and religion, or more properly between science and ecclesiasticism, demonstrates the progressive character of true religion There never has been a conflict between science and religion. Science has never waged war upon religion. It has from time to time been forced to disclose the fallacies of various theological dogmas, and a fierce struggle has as often ensued. But whenever theo-

ogy has been forced to yield, religion has always been the gainer, for every greatly advanced step that has ever been taken by science has by just so much enlarged, exalted, and refined man's conceptions of the Deity and his attributes. And no one will deny that, in so far as man's conceptions of the Deity and his attributes have been thus exalted, by just so much have the religious emotions of reverence, love, and worship been justified, increased, and exalted. Science, therefore, in the nineteenth century has, in this sense, continued the work which Jesus began in the first century. For one of the greatest services that Jesus performed for religion and for humanity was his express repudiation of the crude, anthropopathic conceptions of God which had been handed down from the early Jewish prophets. In their place he has given us a conception of God, his attributes, and his relations to man, that has served to intensify, purify, exalt, and justify that instinctive emotion which is the basic attribute of all religions. And science has continued the work by revealing truths which serve to confirm the intuitions of the Master and justify his conclusions. Not that scientists have deliberately set themselves to do this thing; for they have not. On the contrary, each new scientific discovery has been the signal for a shout in chorus that "religion has been destroyed, and God has been eliminated from the universe." But when the tumult subsides it is always found that God still reigns and religion still lives. A man-made dogma may have been shown to be fallacious, but religion is all the stronger for the elimination of an error.

Perhaps it is just as well that scientists have chosen to assume a hostile attitude to religion, for its friends can always rest assured that its survival is due to its vitality and not to any lack of aggressive effort on the part of its enemies

On the whole, science has been religion's best friend, and the Church is beginning to realize the fact. No intelligent Christian would now be willing to see any one of the great discoveries of modern science eliminated from the world's stock of knowledge, however determinedly his church may have resisted the innovation when it was first promulgated. No Roman Catholic would now consent to a return to the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, although his church fought the Copernican system for more than two hundred years. No Protestant would willingly consent to the elimination of the Newtonian theorem from the world's stock of science, although, as Luther had reviled Copernicus, so did his successors denounce Newton because "he substituted gravity for Providence".¹ No intelligent Christian would now consent to part with his knowledge of geology, notwithstanding the rudeness of his first awakening from the poetic dream of a six-day creation. And so with the law of evolution. There are few Christians among those who have given intelligent attention to the study of the subject, who could be induced to relinquish the lofty conceptions of the nature and attributes of the Deity, growing out of the contemplation of the infinite wisdom and power displayed in the great law of progressive

¹ See White's "Warfare of Science with Theology," Vol. I. pp. 16, 126

development of organic and spiritual life from the moneron to man. Much less could he be induced to return to his former crude and anthropomorphic conception of God as a being of limited intelligence, who is obliged to supplement his work from time to time in order to develop new ideas or to provide for unexpected emergencies. In a word, the intelligent Christian of to-day has learned that every step in the progress of science, instead of destroying Christianity or weakening its vital force, serves but to confirm its essential doctrines, and to stimulate to their highest expression those emotions of awe, reverence, and worship which are the common attributes of all religions.

7 It now seems evident that the emotion of religious worship possesses a profound psychological and scientific significance. It is instinctive and universal. It becomes stronger with the increasing intelligence of mankind, keeping pace with the progressive development of the other useful faculties of the human mind. It suffers no diminution of vitality by reason of scientific advancement. It finds its highest expression in the most enlightened nations, where it is the life of every benevolent and charitable enterprise, — of every institution for the amelioration of human suffering or for the elevation of mankind. These facts alone constitute *prima facie* proof that the object of worship is a living reality. If it were any other emotion than that of religious worship, no scientist would hesitate to declare that to be the only tenable conclusion. Scientists would point out the impossibility of a faculty without a function, or of love without an existing object of love capable of

reciprocal affection.¹ And they would be logically and scientifically right, for these are psychological axioms. If, therefore, the love of God is not an exception to the rule, that instinctive, omnipresent, universal sentiment which has existed in every unperverted human soul since the dawn of creation is an inductive verification of the fundamental tenet of every religion.

If experience of the past is a guide to the future, we are now in possession of the key to a solution of the problem of the reconciliation of science with religion. There are but two possible ways by which this desirable consummation can be reached, and as either one of these methods excludes the other, there is but one

One of these methods is for inductive science to utterly *disprove* the essential doctrines of religion; and the other is for science to *prove* the essential truth of those doctrines beyond the possibility of a rational doubt. That is to say, the proof should at least be so conclusive that science can no longer decide against the claims of religion on a *priori* grounds, so conclusive that the burden of proof will rest upon the opponents of religion, so conclusive that no other hypothesis will account for all the facts

As we have seen, scientists have already tried the first method and failed. Thus far every induction of modern science has tended to confirm the essential doctrines of the Church. Only the non-essential dogmas of theology have been shaken. It is reason-

¹ For a fuller statement of this argument, see "The Law of Psychic Phenomena," page 408

able to suppose, therefore, that further inductions will still further confirm the essentials. This supposition is strongly reinforced by two considerations. One is that the study of those inductive sciences that directly or indirectly concern religion has thus far been largely in the hands of those who are either opposed or indifferent to the claims of religion. The other is that the friends of religion have thus far given very inadequate attention to the inductive study of religion itself, and much less of those sciences which have been heralded as the ruthless destroyers of religion. The mistake is obvious, for if there is truth in religion it cannot suffer by being brought into contact with any truth in science. There are not two orders of truth in the universe, one antagonistic to the other. If, therefore, there is truth in science and truth in religion, the more deeply those of science are penetrated the more obvious will be their harmony with religion. It follows that if there is truth in both, science will yet furnish the data for the inductive study of religion. When that day comes, the "reconciliation" will be inaugurated, and religion and science will read the same Bible and study the same text-books of science, and join, in a scientific and practical sense, in "looking through nature up to nature's God."

CHAPTER II.

PSYCHOLOGY.

General Principles of Psychology illustrated by Facts of Evolution — "The Law of Psychic Phenomena" — Its Hypothesis sustained by Facts of Evolution — A Summary of Fundamental Principles — The Dual Mind — The Law of Suggestion — Objective and Subjective Minds differentiated — Their Powers and their Limitations — Suggestion defined — Hypnotism — Faculties of the Two Minds tabulated — An Analysis of the Objective Mind — Its one Faculty Inductive Reason — Its Defective Memory — Its Dependence upon Cultivation and Refunctioning — Its Faculties constitute Pure Intellect — The Mind of Reason and Judgment — Its Sphere of Activity purely Mundane — It is the Product of Evolutionary Development — It perishes with the Body — The Subjective Mind — It is the Primary Intelligence — It existed Millions of Years in Animal Life before a Brain was evolved — It is the Ultimate Intelligence — Synchronic Action of the Two Minds — Genius — The Brain not the Organ of the Subjective Mind — The Dual Mind normally controlled by the Objective Mind — The Law of Suggestion its Instrument — Voluntary and Involuntary Functions — One by the Objective Mind, the Other by the Subjective — Exceptions in Deadly Peril — The Subjective Mind is fitted especially for a Higher Plane of Existence

BEFORE proceeding with the consideration of the main questions, it will be necessary to lay the foundation by a brief statement of the fundamental principles of psychology, from which some of my conclusions will be derived. It will be seen, in subsequent chapters, that the basic facts of elementary psychology and those of organic evolution are identical; but we will first consider some of the

fundamental principles of psychology as developed by the researches of modern science

In 1893 I published my first work, entitled "The Law of Psychic Phenomena," in which I tentatively formulated a working hypothesis for the systematic study of all psychological, or, more specifically, psychical phenomena. That hypothesis was the result of more than thirty years of systematic search for an underlying principle, which I had the faith to believe must exist, and which would, when found, correlate all psychical phenomena, and possibly remove them all from the domain of superstition. More than six years have elapsed since the publication of that hypothesis, and as no fact tending to disprove it has yet been brought to my attention, I feel warranted in assuming its correctness, and carrying it to its legitimate conclusions in every field of psychological inquiry.

For a full discussion of the hypothesis and its application to psychological phenomena in general, I must refer the reader to my work above mentioned. It will be necessary, however, to make a brief summary of it here, in order to make my meaning, in other parts of this book, clear to those who are not familiar with my earlier works. The evidences of the correctness of my hypothesis, which were set forth in my two former works,¹ will not be repeated here, except where it becomes necessary for the elucidation of the text, but further evidences will be adduced which will in themselves be conclusive.

¹ "The Law of Psychic Phenomena" and "A Scientific Demonstration of the Future Life"

The first proposition of my hypothesis may be stated as follows:—

Man is endowed with a dual mind.

Stated thus conservatively, the proposition will not be seriously questioned by any student of psychology who has kept pace with the discoveries of modern science. I prefer, however, to state it provisionally, thus —

Man is endowed with two minds

I prefer this method of stating the proposition for two reasons. First, because it appears to be true. That is to say, everything happens just as though it were true, and this is all that any scientist pretends to expect in a working hypothesis. Secondly, I prefer it because it admits of clearer treatment, inasmuch as it requires less of roundabout phraseology to express my exact meaning. The conclusions derivable from the proposition are, however, precisely the same, whichever way it is stated. I adhere, therefore, to my usual way of expressing it, and state, as my first proposition, that "Man is endowed with two minds."

I distinguish them by designating one as the objective mind, and the other as the subjective mind.

The objective mind is that of ordinary, waking consciousness. Its media of cognition are the five physical senses. Its highest function is that of reasoning. It is specially adapted to cope with the exigencies of a physical environment. It is the function of the brain; and the brain is the ultimate product of organic evolution. This, it may be remarked parenthetically, is the mind with which materialistic scientists deal when seeking to demon-

strate, by means of the scalpel and other appliances of experimental surgery, that even the soul itself cannot survive the onslaughts of medical science.

The subjective mind is that intelligence which is most familiarly manifested to us when the brain is asleep, or its action is otherwise inhibited, as in dreams, or in spontaneous somnambulism, or in trance or trance-like states and conditions, as in induced somnambulism or hypnotism. Any one who is at all familiar with the phenomena resulting from any of these mental conditions is aware that the most wonderful exhibitions of intellectual activity and power often result. The significant feature of the phenomena is that, other things being equal, the intellectual powers thus displayed bear an exact proportion to the depth of the trance (to use a generic term); or, in other words, the more completely the action of the brain is inhibited the more phenomenal will be the manifestation of intellectual activity.

Thus far I have not travelled outside the range of common observation and experience, especially of professional men. But it must be admitted that these facts alone make a *prima facie* showing of duality of mind. There are thousands of illustrations of the law which amount to demonstrative proof, but they cannot be discussed in this connection. 'It may be remarked, however, that materialistic scientists themselves have demonstrated, some of them unwittingly, that the brain is not the organ of the subjective mind.¹ In later chapters

¹ See cases cited in "A Scientific Demonstration of the Future Life," chapter xv

of this book it will be shown that the proposition is demonstrated by the facts of organic and mental evolution

The second proposition is this —

The subjective mind is constantly amenable to control by suggestion.

The meaning of this is that the subjective mind involuntarily accepts as veridical the ideas or statements of fact imparted to it. These statements or ideas may be imparted orally by another person, in which case they are called "suggestions," or they may arise from the education of the individual; in which case they are termed "auto-suggestions." There are no exceptions to this law, although there are some apparent exceptions. But it will invariably be found that the apparent exceptions are the clearest possible illustrations of the absolute universality of the law. A common illustration of the power of oral suggestion by another is witnessed when a hypnotist declares to his endormed subject that he is a third person. The alacrity with which the subject accepts the suggestion, and the marvellous fidelity to nature with which he will personate the character suggested, are among the most striking phenomena of hypnotism. Again, a striking illustration of the force of an auto-suggestion, arising from the education and belief of the subject, is afforded by so-called spirit mediums. They are self-hypnotized psychics, and the suggestion arising from their education and environment is that, when they are in the subjective state, they are controlled by disembodied spirits. This suggestion is accepted, of course, and the supposed spirit is personated with

the same marvellous fidelity to nature that characterizes the performances of the hypnotic subject.

A corollary of the law of suggestion is that—

The subjective mind is incapable of inductive reasoning

That is to say, it is incapable of instituting an independent inquiry by the process of collecting facts for the purpose of reasoning from them up to a general principle or law. Under the law of suggestion it must obtain its data, or premises, from the objective mind. Besides, it possesses a higher power than that of induction,—a shorter road to essential truth, namely, the power or faculty of intuitive perception. This subject will be more fully treated hereinafter.

The following table exhibits in condensed form the results of a complete analysis of the faculties of the two minds

<i>Objective Mind</i>			<i>Subjective Mind</i>		
Pure Intellect	{		1	Instinct or Intuition	Limitations
			2	Controlled by Suggestion	
			3	Inductive Reasoning	
			4	Deductive Reasoning (Imperfect)	
			5	Memory (Imperfect)	
			6	Brain Memories of Emotional Experiences	
			7	Seat of the Emotions	
			8	Telepathic Powers	
			9	Telekinetic Energy	

alarm us, therefore, when material scientists demonstrate the fact that the objective mind, being the function of the brain, and inherent in that organ, necessarily perishes with the body

It will, in fact, become apparent, as we proceed, that the subjective mind is the primary intelligence with which all sentient creatures are endowed, for it existed untold millions of years before a brain was developed in the process of organic evolution. It is also the ultimate intelligence of man, for it survives the death of the body,¹ and the consequent extinguishment of the objective mind. The latter, as before remarked, is a product of organic evolution. Like every other physical weapon of offence or defence, it was evolved in response to the necessities of a physical environment. It is specially adapted to such an environment, and to no other. Its powers of inductive reasoning enable man to grope his way through the mazes of an environment of ignorance and uncertainty, and gradually to distinguish between the true and the false in the realm of physical life. In that life it is the most potent agency known to man; for it enables him gradually to acquire a knowledge of some of the laws of the physical universe, and thus ameliorate his physical condition. In the realm of human laws and human government it also finds ample scope for all the powers it can ever possess. But it is of the earth, earthy.

Before closing this brief summary it may be well to remark that, whilst the two minds are each capable of independent action, they often act in perfect synchronism. This accounts for many otherwise

¹ See "A Scientific Demonstration of the Future Life."

inexplicable phenomena, those of genius being the most conspicuous examples. The specific means by which this synchronism is effected, or how it is that the subjective mind exercises its power to inhibit the action of the objective mind, is not at present known. We can only be certain that it possesses that power by observing the phenomena; that of hypnotism alone demonstrating the power of the subjective mind to inhibit the action of the brain. Cerebral anatomists have not yet studied the subject from the standpoint of duality of mind, and hypnotists are not agreed upon the condition of the brain of a hypnotized subject. The old school of hypnotists still adhere to the idea that the brain must necessarily be the instrument through which all intelligence is manifested. As long as scientists adhere to that idea, there never can be any substantial progress made in experimental psychology, for if psychic phenomena teach anything worth knowing, it is that the brain is not the organ of the highest intelligence in man, — the subjective mind, the organized intelligence of the human soul. I repeat, therefore, that the subjective mind is the primary intelligence of all sentient creatures, and the ultimate intelligence of man, whereas the brain is a specialized physical organ of which the objective mind is the function, and it pertains as exclusively to this life as does any other physical organ or function. It controls the subjective mind in all the ordinary affairs of this life — in everything except in matters of conscience and the primary instinct of self-preservation — because it is specially adapted to the exigencies of a physical environ-

ment. This it does by virtue of the law of suggestion. But by virtue of the same law the subjective mind can totally inhibit the action of the brain, just as it can inhibit all sensation in the body. Just how this inhibition is effected it is not my present purpose to inquire. I leave that to the cerebral anatomists, who will some day awaken to the realization that they have a potent intelligence to deal with that is not of the brain. It is probable, however, that the inhibition is effected by the simple process of withdrawing the blood from the brain, as in ordinary sleep. Be that as it may, it is certain that the subjective mind not only possesses that power, but it can assume control over every nerve, muscle, and fibre of the body. Ordinarily it exercises habitual control over the involuntary functions only, leaving the brain in control of the voluntary movements, but in cases of imminent and deadly peril it inhibits the action of the objective or reasoning mind, and seizes upon the whole nervous and muscular system. In such cases feats of almost superhuman strength and agility are performed, pain is inhibited and fear banished, until the crisis is past ¹

Little need be said, in this connection, about the faculties of the subjective mind, as they will be dealt with more at large in subsequent chapters. Their names are indicative of their functions, and all that needs to be said in this connection is that, unlike the objective mind, each one of its faculties and powers is obviously indispensable to the com-

¹ See "The Law of Psychic Phenomena" for a full discussion of this subject.

plete mental equipment of a disembodied spirit
Not one necessary faculty is lacking, and not one
faculty is superfluous, and not one faculty belonging
exclusively to the subjective mind performs any
normal function in the physical life.

CHAPTER III.

PSYCHOLOGY OF MICRO-ORGANISMS.

The General Theory of Evolution — Too well established to require Full Discussion — The Pedigree of Man stamped upon his Physical Organism — The Three Theories of Evolution Materialistic, Agnostic, and Theistic — Darwin, Romanes, and Haeckel accepted as Authorities for Facts, not for Theories — Facts showing Duality of Mind — The Brain not the Organ of the Subjective Mind — The Genesis of the Human Soul — The very Lowest Form of Animal Life — The Moneron — An "Organism without Organs" endowed with a Mind — Quotations from Gates, Binet, and Others — The "Psychic Life of Micro-Organisms" — Their Habits and Mind Capacity — Reflex Action discussed — Not Adequate to account for Phenomena — All Vital Phenomena Present in Non-Differentiated Cells — Wonderful Instincts of the *Diffugia* — Romanes on Instinct — The Subjective Mind of Man and Animals Identical — It is the Mind that is inherited from Ancestry, Near and Remote — Instincts increase with Intelligence — Primary and Secondary Instincts — New Ones developed in Game Animals — Change of Environment develops New Dangers, hence New or Secondary Instincts — All Instincts Inheritable. — Subjective Mind of Man the Sum of Ancestral Instincts — It antedated Brain by many Ages — Brain, therefore, not the Organ of Subjective Mind.

THE general theory of evolution is too thoroughly established to require any defence at this time, and it is too well understood to require a treatise on the subject to enable my readers to understand the full import of what I shall have to say in the following pages. The pedigree of physical man is too plainly stamped upon his physical structure to admit of a rational doubt of his descent, or

ascent, from the lower animals. The steps of that ascent are too clearly defined in the structure of the lower animals to admit of a reasonable doubt that the lowest protoplasmic unicellular organism known to science contained the promise and potentiality of physical manhood. Nor is it, in my opinion, open to a rational doubt that the progressive steps required to evolve man from the lowest form of animal life were the result of an intelligent plan, and not of chance, or of a series of fortuitous circumstances.

There are three well-defined theories of evolution recognized by science and classified as follows:—

1. Materialistic evolution, which denies everything but matter and motion in the evolutionary process

2. Agnostic evolution, which postulates an unknown and unknowable as the basis and explanation of the process

3. Theistic evolution, which assumes a God back of all, working out results along the unalterable line of natural law, and by physical forces exclusively

There is another theory held by some, called the development theory, which assumes the orderly unfolding of the system of the universe under divine guidance, according to a divine plan, and with various divine interpositions or special creations.

These are Standard Dictionary definitions, but they are sufficiently explicit for my present purpose. They are mentioned for the purpose of showing that the theory of evolution which I propose to outline differs essentially from any of the recognized classifications. It comes nearer to the definition above given of "theistic evolution," but differs from

that in not ascribing everything to physical force exclusively.

My hypothesis pertains exclusively to the evolution of animal life, and the concomitant psychological development, from the monera to man. It assumes a God back of all, working out results along the unalterable line of natural law, but largely by mental or spiritual forces

I accept the general theory of organic evolution, in all its fulness, as laid down by materialistic scientists, such as Darwin, Haeckel, Romanes, and other great lights, but I shall use their facts, and to some extent their arguments, to demonstrate my psychological theories. That is to say, I shall attempt to show that their facts and their arguments, carried to their legitimate conclusions, demonstrate much more than is dreamed of in their philosophy, that their facts prove just the opposite to their materialistic conclusions, and that, instead of eliminating God from the universe, or relegating him to the domain of the "utterly" unknowable, they substantiate the essential doctrines of Christianity relating to his attributes and his kinship to humanity

The first in order for consideration will be the evidences which the facts of evolution afford, (1) of duality of mind, (2) that the brain is not the organ of the subjective mind, and (3) of the genesis of the human soul

We will begin with the first appearance of animal life upon this planet. I shall first quote from Haeckel, — first, because he is a recognized authority among material scientists; secondly, because he is

in some respects superior to Darwin, having written later than that great pioneer in the science, thirdly, because Darwin, in later editions of his works, indorses Haeckel; and fourthly, because the latter distinctly repudiates Christianity and the doctrine of a future life. I cannot, therefore, be accused of selecting my authorities from among those who would indorse my views. He says:—

“If we would now undertake the difficult attempt to discover the phylogenetic course of evolution of these twenty-two human ancestral stages from the very commencement of life, and if we venture to lift the dark veil which covers the oldest secrets of the organic history of the earth, we must undoubtedly seek the first beginning of life among those wonderful living beings which, under the name of monera, we have already frequently pointed out as the simplest known organisms. They are, at the same time, the simplest conceivable organisms, for their entire body, in its fully developed and freely moving condition, consists merely of a small piece of structureless primitive slime or plasson, of a small fragment of that extraordinarily important nitrogenous carbon compound, which is now universally esteemed the most important material substratum of all the active phenomena of life.”¹

Again, he says —

“The monera are the simplest permanent cytods. Their entire body consists of merely soft, structureless plasson. However thoroughly we examine them with the help of the most delicate reagents and the strongest optical instruments, we yet find that all the parts are completely homogeneous. These monera are, therefore, in the strict

¹ *The Evolution of Man*, vol. II p. 43, Appletons' ed., 1896

est sense of the word, 'organisms without organs,' or even in a strictly philosophical sense, they might not even be called organisms, since they possess no organs, since they are not composed of various particles. They can only be called organisms, in so far as they are capable of exercising the organic phenomena of life, of nutrition, reproduction, sensation, and movement."¹

Here, then, we have the very lowest form of animal life, — "an organism without organs," a simple mass of plasson, minus even the nucleus which belongs to the true cell, and therefore absolutely without physical organs. And yet it is endowed with a mind, — an organized intelligence. The fact that it adapts means to ends constitutes indubitable evidence that it has carried on a mental process. A living creature is a mind organism, for it is mind, and mind alone, that distinguishes the animate from the inanimate. A cell is a living creature. A cell, therefore, possesses a mind.

"Unicellular organisms," says Dr. Gates, "possess all the different forms of activity to be found in the higher animals. Thus the simplest cell can transform food into tissue and other metabolic products; and this is the basis of all the nutritive activities and processes of the higher animals, the cell can move parts of itself and is capable of locomotion, and this is the basis of all movement in the higher animals brought about by bones and muscles. The cell can feel a stimulus and respond, and this is the basis of the sensory faculties of the higher animals; the cell can reproduce itself by segmentation, and this is the basis of reproduction in the higher animals, the cell on dividing inherits the actual

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 47

qualities of its parent mass, and this is the basis of heredity, in short, the cell contains, in simplest form, all of the activities to be found in man." ¹

Binet, in his great work,² corroborates all that Dr Gates alleges, and demonstrates the mistake of those scientists who hold that all acts of micro-organisms are due to "irritability," or reflex action. One of the many phenomena mentioned to show the complexity of the psychic life of micro-organisms is "the existence of the power of selection, exercised either in the search for food, or in the manœuvres attending conjugation. The act of selection is a capital phenomenon, we may take it as the characteristic feature of functions pertaining to the nervous system. As Romanes has indeed observed, the power of choice may be regarded as the criterion of psychical faculties."

In his preface to the American edition of his work, Binet remarks —

"If the existence of psychological phenomena in lower organisms is denied, it will be *necessary to assume that these phenomena can be superadded in the course of evolution*, in proportion as an organism grows more and more complex. *Nothing could be more inconsistent with the teachings of general physiology*, which shows us that *all vital phenomena are previously present in non-differentiated cells*" (The italics are mine)

Binet also quotes a very interesting statement of the observations of Verworn, which reveal the exist-

¹ See "Therapist," December, 1895

² The Psychic Life of Micro-Organisms, Open Court Pub. Co., Chicago.

ence of curious instincts among the Rhizopods. The *Diffugia ampulla*, which inhabits a shell formed of particles of sand, emits long pseudopodia which search at the bottom of the water for the materials necessary to construct a new case for the filial organism to which it gives birth by division. The pseudopod, after having touched a particle of sand, contracts, and the grain of sand, adhering to the pseudopod, is seen to pass into the body of the animal. Verworn, instead of grains of sand, placed small fragments of colored glass about the animal; some time afterwards, he noticed a heap of these fragments on the bottom of the shell. He then saw a bunch of protoplasm issue from the shell, representing the new *Diffugia* produced by division. Thereupon the materials collected by the mother-organism — the fragments of colored glass — came forth from the shell and enveloped the body of the new individual in a sheath similar to that encasing the mother. These fragments of glass, loosely inter-joined at first, were now cemented together by a substance secreted by the body of the animal.

“Two facts,” continues Binet, “are to be remarked in this observation: first, the act whereby the *Diffugia* collects the materials for providing the young individual with a case, is an act of preadaptation to an end not present, but remote, this act, therefore, has all the marks of an instinct. Further, the instinct of the *Diffugia* exhibits great precision, for the *Diffugia* not only knows how to distinguish, at the bottom of the water, the materials available for its purpose, but it takes only the quantity of material necessary to enable the young individual to acquire a well-built case; there is never an excess.

"It is interesting to note that the *Diffugia* does not act differently from animals possessing more highly complicated organizations and endowed with differentiated nervous systems, as, for instance, the larvæ of Phryganids which form their sheaths from shells, grains of sand, or minute slivers."¹

I have made these quotations, almost at random, not to exhibit any special order of development, but to show that in the very lowest form of animal life — in the simplest organism known to science, from which man can trace his ancestry, there exists a mind, — a mind of most wonderful complexity, and possessing transcendent powers, — *an instinctive mind*. This is the important point to be observed. It is an instinctive mind, as distinguished from merely reflex action. Romanes, in his great work, "Mind in the Lower Animals," makes this clear distinction between instinct and reflex action —

"The most important point to observe in the first instance is that instinct involves *mental* operations, for this is the only point that serves to distinguish instinctive from reflex action "²

I have been thus particular in establishing the fact that a mental organism exists in the very lowest forms of animal life, for the reason that I propose to show that this mental organism is the embryonal archetype of the subjective mind in man. That is to say, the subjective mind of man is a direct inheritance from that of the lowest unicellular organism,

¹ Op cit, Preface

² This observation is repeated in his "Mental Evolution in Animals," which see, p 160

without a change in its essential characteristics save that which is incident to development

The subjective mind of man, therefore, is identical with the instinctive intelligence of animals, differing only in degree of development and complexity of organism. I wish this fact to be distinctly borne in mind, for not only is it the salient fact in the history of organic and mental evolution, from the moneron to man, but the inevitable conclusions derivable therefrom are literally of infinite importance.

The steps and processes of this development are clearly set forth in the works of such men as Darwin, Romanes, and other great biologists, to whose works the reader is referred for a detailed treatment of the subject. It may be said in general terms, however, that the instinctive intelligence of sentient creatures increases in range and complexity in exact proportion to the evolutionary development of animal life from the lowest to the highest physical organism. That is to say, at each upward step in the phylogenetic series, new instincts are developed to provide for the exigencies of changed environmental relationships. The process is easy to understand.

Instincts are divided by Romanes into two classes, namely, primary and secondary.

Primary instincts are those natural, spontaneous impulses that move animals, without reasoning, experience, or the intervention of objective intelligence, toward the actions that are essential to their existence, preservation, and development.

Secondary instincts are impulses of like character to the above, but were originally intelligent, and by

frequent repetition have become automatic. Such actions, after being performed for a few generations, become as firmly established as the primary instincts, and are then inherited by succeeding generations.

These added or secondary instincts are the results of changed environment. That is to say, whenever new dangers are to be guarded against, or new wants are to be supplied, new instincts are developed. Thus, as Romanes points out, "the development of firearms, together with the development of sporting interests, has given game of all kinds an instinctive knowledge of what constitutes 'safe distance,' as every sportsman can testify"¹ Romanes then quotes from a paper on "Hereditary Instinct" by Andrew Knight, as follows:—

"I have witnessed, within the period above mentioned, of nearly sixty years, a very great change in the habits of the woodcock. In the first part of that time, when it had recently arrived in the autumn it was very tame; it usually chuckled when disturbed, and took only a very short flight. It is now, and has been during many years, comparatively a very wild bird, which generally rises in silence, and takes a comparatively long flight, excited, I conceive, by increased hereditary fear of man"²

It has also been noted by sportsmen that game animals keep pace with the increased range and effectiveness of modern firearms. What was a safe distance fifty years ago is within easy range of modern weapons, but game animals have already learned the limits of

¹ *Mental Evolution in Animals*, p. 197.

² *Phil. Trans.*, 1837, p. 369

the new range, and consequently "make themselves scarce" within its radius

These are but samples of the vast number of illustrations of the principle involved, but they serve to show how new instincts are acquired and old ones modified with every change of environment, and with every step forward in the process of evolutionary development of animal life and intelligence. It is easy to see that, in the course of that development from the moneron to man, the mental organism thus developed must have become wonderfully complex, even before man appeared upon the stage of being. And when we remember that man inherited this already complex mental organism, and has since continued to develop it in a constantly increasing ratio it is easy to understand that a godlike mental organism necessarily resulted, and this we find in the subjective mind of man.

Now, there are two things which must be distinctly borne in mind in this connection —

The first is that all instincts are transmitted by inheritance from one generation to another from the lowest to the highest physical and mental organism. This is the shibboleth of science. This is especially insisted upon by those scientists who imagine that a demonstration of its truth eliminates God from the universe. I accept their premises, but not their conclusions, as I shall show hereinafter. I accept their premises because they are demonstrably true. I reject their conclusions because they are demonstrably untrue.

It is true that instincts are transmitted by inheritance, and as Darwin, Romanes, and others have

clearly shown, it is true of both primary and secondary instincts. Were it not true of primary instincts, animal life would have become extinct before it passed beyond the primordial germ in the line of development. Were it not true of secondary instincts, progressive development would have been confined within very narrow limits, for it was by that means that the species was enabled to profit by the new experiences of individuals, incident to changing environment. Hence it is that the subjective mind of man represents the sum of all the useful instinctive knowledge possessed by its ancestry, near and remote, beginning with the lowest unicellular organism known to science.

The second proposition which I desire my readers to bear in mind is that this mental organism began its earthly career millions of years before a brain was evolved in the process of organic evolution. In fact, according to the best authorities, the archilithic period, or primordial epoch, which was the age of skull-less animals, consumed considerably more than one-half of all the years that have elapsed since the advent of organic life on this planet. Thus, Haeckel¹ estimates the comparative length of the archilithic epoch as 53.6 per cent of the whole. During this period the lowest vertebrates appeared, but a brain was not evolved until a later epoch.

It will thus be seen that the primary intelligence of sentient life, the instinctive mind, the mental organism that has since developed into that godlike intelligence which we now recognize as the subjective mind of man, existed and performed its functions

¹ *The Evolution of Man*, vol. II pp. 11-18

with unerring prescience, without the aid of a brain structure, for untold millions of years. We have, therefore, the strongest possible *a priori* grounds for assuming that the brain is not now, and never has been, the organ of the subjective mind, and if the *a posteriori* proofs all conspire to confirm that hypothesis, we can safely draw the most momentous conclusions therefrom

CHAPTER IV.

EVOLUTION AND THE SUBJECTIVE MIND.

The Brain not the Organ of the Subjective Mind — Proven by its Identity with the Instinctive Minds of Animals — The Latter proven by its Continuity from Lowest Organisms up to Man — Continuity proven by Comparative Analysis of Faculties and Functions — Instinct in Lower Animals Identical with Intuition in Man — Its Definition — The Deductive Faculty potentially Perfect in Subjective Minds of Animals as well as Men — The Emotions are Faculties of the Subjective Minds of Men and Animals alike — They antedated the Brain — Objective Mind is Emotionless — Induction and Concomitant Memories, its only Functions or Faculties — Telepathy a Power of the Subjective Mind — It exists potentially in Animals — Telekinesis a Subjective Power — It is the Power that enabled Jesus and Peter to walk upon the Water — It reappears in so called Spirit Phenomena — The Mysterious Motility of the Polycystids — Science cannot explain it under Physical Laws — All Subjective Powers derived from Lower Animals, beginning with the Unicellular Organisms — Further Proof by Experimental Surgery — Scientific Search for a Soul with a Scalpel — Materialistic Arguments from Cerebral Anatomy disproved — They have searched in the Wrong Place for the Soul — The Soul is Immanent in the Body, not Inherent in it — Proofs from Voluntary and Involuntary Muscles and Functions — Time Reaction Different in the Two Minds — Phenomena when Death approaches — Subjective Mind grows Stronger as Objective Mind grows Weaker — Strongest Manifestations in the Hour of Death, after Brain has ceased to act — Death-Bed Scene when Governor Matthews passed away — The Physician's Testimony — The Wonderful Power of Suggestion then exhibited — Proofs from Experimental Hypnotism — The Phenomena of Amnesia a Crucial Test — Spontaneous Somnambulism — Proofs from Phenomena of Dreams

BEFORE proceeding to recite the facts demonstrative of the proposition that the brain is not the organ of the subjective mind, we must first show

that the instinctive mind of the lower animals is identical with the subjective mind of man. The fact of continuity alone, if it can be shown with reasonable certainty, is presumptive evidence of the truth of the proposition, for it would require a violent stretch of the imagination to conceive the idea that an organized intelligence, once located in a physical structure and performing its functions independently of specialized physical organs, could suddenly change its method and organ of manifestation. At least it would require the strongest kind of affirmative evidence to substantiate the proposition.

Referring now to the table in Chapter II, in which the faculties of the two minds are differentiated, it will be seen that that of intuitive perception heads the list of faculties of the subjective mind. I think no one will dispute the proposition that this faculty in man is identical with what is known in general terms as instinct in the lower animals. It performs the same functions in both, the difference being one of degree and not of kind, and they may, therefore, be defined in the same terms. I define the faculty as follows —

Instinct, or intuition, is the faculty possessed by each sentient being, in proportion to its development and in harmony with its environment, to perceive or apprehend, antecedent to and independently of reason, experience, or instruction, those laws of nature which pertain to the well-being of the individual and of the species to which it belongs.

Instinct in the lower animals, as every one is aware, is chiefly concerned in the preservation of the life of the individual and the promotion of the welfare of the

species, and as I shall endeavor to show later on, the higher manifestation of the same faculty in man is promotive of the same general object, the difference consisting in its higher aims and ever-broadening altruism. For the present it is sufficient to remark that the objective mind possesses no faculty akin to instinct or intuition. The faculty of inductive reasoning, as we have already seen, is the only distinctive faculty possessed by the objective mind, and that is the very opposite of intuition.

The next faculty on the list is that of deduction, which is potentially perfect in the subjective mind. Inerrant deduction is the instinctive logic of the subjective mind, and this is as true of the lower animals as it is of man. It is the concomitant of intuition in the subjective mind, and of induction in the objective mind. That is to say, both induction and intuition deal with general laws, the one by the slow and laborious process of gathering facts of experience, and the other by immediate perception, antecedent to experience and independent of reason. Deduction is the faculty which reasons from general laws or principles to all legitimate conclusions, and it is, therefore, the concomitant of both induction and intuition. Induction, depending as it does upon laborious cultivation for whatever degree of efficiency it may possess, is necessarily imperfect, and hence the imperfection of its concomitant faculty, deduction. On the other hand, instinct, or intuition, is potentially perfect, and it is, moreover, inherent in the subjective mind, and hence the potential perfection of the deductive powers of the subjective mind in every phase of its activity, from the lowest to the

highest mental organism, especially when the activity of the brain is totally inhibited.

The next on the list are the emotions. These obviously belong wholly to the subjective mind, since they are a direct inheritance from the lower animals, including, of course, all that existed before a brain was evolved. It is almost superfluous to add, in this connection, that the "animal passions and propensities" thus inherited, when regulated, elevated, and purified by reason and conscience, contain the promise and potency of all that is capable of imparting happiness and joy to the soul of man in this world or the world to come. There is no valid reason for supposing that the objective mind experiences any emotion whatever. Scientists tell us that every emotion, as well as every faculty, has its special cortical area or compartment. This may be, and doubtless is, true; but it does not follow that the emotions, as such, are felt by the objective mind. On the contrary, there is every reason to suppose that the brain merely registers the conscious emotional experiences of the subjective mind. That is to say, new brain cells are created for every conscious experience of the individual, emotional or otherwise, and these cells are the receptacles of brain memories. But they are only memories. The seat of the emotions is, nevertheless, in the subjective mind, where it was located æons before a brain was developed in the process of organic evolution.

The next on the list is telepathy. There are many who hold that telepathy is largely employed by animals to supply their deficiencies in oral means of communication. I have not sufficiently investi-

gated this question to warrant me in expressing a decided opinion whether animals communicate with each other by that means or not. But I have conducted a series of experiments which convince me that, under favorable conditions, man may influence certain domestic animals telepathically in a very marked degree. Be that as it may, certain it is that telepathy is a faculty of the subjective mind of man, and the power must therefore have existed, potentially, in that of his ancestry, near and remote. It is also certain that the objective mind of man possesses no power akin to telepathy.

Of telekinetic energy little need be said in this immediate connection. It is the power of producing motion in ponderable bodies without physical contact or connection. It is that power which is sometimes manifested in so-called spirit phenomena, such as table-lifting, rapping, slate-writing, *et hoc genus omne*. It is that power which is sometimes manifested in the levitation of the body of the psychic. It is that power which enabled Jesus and Peter to walk upon the water. It is manifestly a power of the subjective mind, for no such energy has ever been manifested in the objective mind. There is no evidence clearly demonstrative that it is possessed by any of the animal kingdom lower than man, although certain animals possess a mysterious energy that material science has never been able to account for. For instance, what is that wonderful energy that enables certain birds to fly directly against a strong wind without the slightest visible motion of their wings? Again, what is that mysterious power that enables certain micro-organ-

isms to propel themselves through a liquid in the absence of physical organs of locomotion? Speaking of this subject, Binet¹ has this to say —

"The Polycystids have a very peculiar manner of moving, the motion is one of perfect translation, uniform and rectilinear, the animal seems to slide all of a piece over the object plate, it can go to the right, to the left, stay its motion and resume it again, it is free in directing its movements. Now, during this movement *nothing can be seen to take place in the body from within or without* An analogous phenomenon is to be observed in the Diatomes. Some scientists have wished to explain the mysterious motion by translation executed by the Gregarines, as being due to an imperceptible undulation of the sarcode, but if there was any undulation whatever, one ought to observe a correlative movement in the granules inside, now, *this is something that is never seen.*

"Thus there still exists a great deal of obscurity concerning the principles determining motion among the proto-organisms. The theories based upon muscular contraction that have been propounded from observing higher animals, *are by no means sufficient to explain the phenomena of motility among certain Protozoa and Protophytes.*" (The italics are mine.)

Now, I do not undertake to say that the energy thus displayed is identical with telekinesis as manifested in the human organism. But since it is true, as the materialistic scientists tell us, that the potential of manhood resides in the amoebæ; and since it is demonstrably true that man is endowed with telekinetic energy, there is no *a priori* ground for denying its

¹ Psychic Life of Micro Organisms, p. 19

existence in the amœbæ We are at least warranted in assuming, provisionally, that theory to be the true one until materialistic science can give us some sort of explanation of the phenomenon on other grounds.

It is not, however, necessary to the validity of our argument to prove that unicellular organisms phenomenally manifest telekinetic energy Nor do I assume it to be true It is sufficient to know that man is thus endowed, and that such powers reside in his subjective mental organism. That being true, it follows that the same energy existed potentially in his ancestry, near and remote

It will thus be seen that indubitable evidence exists in every faculty of the subjective mind, of its derivation from the lower animals, the difference being of degree That is to say, the function of instinct is the same in man as in the lower animals, for all impulses, desires, or emotions which are promotive of the well-being of the individual or of the species, belong to the domain of instinct or intuition And this is true whether they are manifested in the lower animals in the impulses of self-preservation and reproduction, or in the noblest acts or impulses of man, when they are promotive of the general welfare of humanity, physically, mentally, morally, or spiritually

The fact of the continuity of this intelligence being thus established, we have a right to assume that, since it began its career and continued to perform its functions for millions of years independently of a cerebral organism, it continues to perform its functions independently of the mental organism which has its seat in the brain I repeat, therefore, with added emphasis, that there is no *a priori* ground or reason for suppos-

ing that the brain is the organ of the subjective mind. Now, if we find that all *a posteriori* proofs tend in the same direction we may safely assume the truth of the proposition to be scientifically established.

I will now briefly state a few of the admitted facts bearing upon this question. Fortunately for my purpose, the materialistic scientists have themselves demonstrated the truth of the proposition by the use of the scalpel. Thus, ex-Surgeon-General Hammond, in his presidential address before the New York Neurological Society, showed that certain faculties of the mind do not have their seat in the brain¹. In his great work on *Insanity*² he reiterates his declaration, and demonstrates by many original experiments that the brain is not the organ of the instinctive faculties. Among other experiments, he totally eliminated the brains of certain animals, and found that the instinctive functions were performed precisely as before. He quotes many eminent authorities to sustain his position, and explicitly declares that the instinctive faculties do *not* reside in the brain. He declares it as his opinion that they are "seated exclusively in the medulla oblongata, or in the spinal cord, or in both those organs." Now, those faculties which are found not to be located in the brain are, as I have already pointed out, all faculties of the subjective mind.

I am not disposed, however, to agree with Dr. Hammond in his confident statement that those faculties are located "exclusively" in any one organ

¹ See *Proceedings of the New York Neurological Society for 1875*

² *A Treatise on Insanity in its Medical Relations* • Appletons, 1883

of the body, much as I admire him for his genius and his vast learning. That declaration he doubtless made without duly considering all the facts collateral to the subject he was then investigating. Be that as it may, he has succeeded in demonstrating duality of mind by the use of the scalpel, and that is the favorite instrument of the material scientists when they set out in search for the human soul. And they have cut and carved, weighed and measured and chemically analyzed the brains of men, living¹ and dead, and because they failed to find a soul in the brain they dogmatically declare that man has no soul. Dr. Hammond, however, has demonstrated that they have all along been looking for it in the wrong place, but as he was not looking for a soul at the time, he did not recognize it when he discovered it.

Materialistic scientists have succeeded in demonstrating that the objective mind is a function of the brain, and that it is inherent in the brain. They have demonstrated that each faculty or sense has a cortical area, or brain centre, exclusively its own, and that when one of the brain centres is eliminated or paralyzed, the corresponding sense is destroyed. "Thus," they argue, "a part of the mind is forever obliterated, and it follows that when all the brain centres are destroyed the whole mind is obliterated." Their conclusion is, of course, that there can be no such thing as a future life.

Now, there can be no doubt of the correctness of their facts, nor of the soundness of their reasoning, so far as they pertain to the objective mind. And if that were the only mental organism existent in

¹ *Vide* Washington Irving Bishop's taking off

man, vain would be his hope of a future life. The objective mind is the function of the brain. It is, therefore, inherent in the brain, and necessarily perishes with that organ.

But it does not necessarily follow that the subjective mind is inherent in any one or more organs of the body. On the contrary, all the facts tend to prove that it exists independently of any specialized organ whatever. We have already seen that the monera are without organs, and yet the subjective mind exists in them, and performs its functions just as perfectly, in proportion to its stage of development, as it does in the most highly organized human being. Again, the facts of telekinesis demonstrate the proposition that the subjective mind can exercise complete control over unorganized matter.

These facts are profoundly significant, and point unmistakably to the conclusion that the soul is a self-existent entity and does not inhere in any organ of the body which it inhabits. In other words, the soul is *immanent*, that is, indwelling, in the body, just as God is immanent in the physical universe, but not inherent in it. That is to say, as God does not depend upon the existence of the physical universe for the continuance of his own existence, neither is the existence of the soul dependent upon that of the body.

Upon no other hypothesis can the immortality of the soul be scientifically or logically predicated; and I repeat, therefore, and state it as a scientific proposition, that *the soul is immanent, and not inherent, in the body*.

It follows that the mind of the soul, or subjective mind, does not inhere in any special organ or organs

of the body, although it employs those organs in phenomenally manifesting itself. It seems extremely probable that it pervades every bone, muscle, sinew, fibre, and tissue of the body. Certain it is that it is potentially able to control them all, and this is one of the evidences of its immanence in every part of the body.

It is well known that it habitually controls the involuntary muscles and functions, and that the objective mind, through the brain and the nerve ganglia connected therewith, normally controls the voluntary muscles and functions of the physical organism. The subjective mind has, therefore, normally the greater part of the work to do, for its domain extends from the centre to the circumference,—from the action of the heart to the metabolism of every cell of which the whole body is composed.

Now, a very important and significant fact in this connection is that the functions of the two minds are not mutually interchangeable. Thus, the objective mind cannot, of its own volition, move one purely involuntary muscle. Reciprocity, or joint control, is possible only in the mixed muscles, such as the sphincters and the organs of respiration. But of the purely involuntary muscles the objective mind has no direct, volitional control. On the other hand, the subjective mind can, and often does, take entire control of the whole body, and wields it at its will. This can be brought about experimentally by means of hypnotism. That is to say, when the brain functions are entirely inhibited, the subjective mind can be made to dominate the whole physical system. It almost invariably occurs when the body is in immi-

nent and deadly peril. In such a crisis the objective senses are benumbed, the brain ceases to act, and a condition of anæsthesia supervenes, but, under the control of the subjective mind, the body acts with preternatural rapidity and precision, and feats of strength are performed that would be absolutely impossible under normal conditions¹ Spontaneous somnambulism furnishes many familiar illustrations of subjective control over both the voluntary and the involuntary muscular and nervous systems

I have cited these well-known facts for the purpose of showing how much more intimate and pervasive must be the connection between the subjective mind and the body than that which obtains between the objective mind and the body. The one controls the whole body without reference to specialized organs, and the other is limited in its sphere of activity, and depends upon a highly specialized physical organ — the brain — for whatever efficiency it may possess in its limited domain. The subjective mind, as shown in its phylogenetic history, acts with equal efficiency in a highly specialized organism, with the functions of the brain in total abeyance, as in hypnotism, or in a crude physical organism, destitute of a brain, as in the animals of the archilithic epoch, or in animals destitute of any physical organs whatever, as in the monera.

The difference being thus provisionally established, we might reasonably expect to find that the time limit of reaction to peripheral stimuli would be materially decreased during hypnosis. I say we might

¹ For a full discussion of this phenomenon, see "The Law of Psychic Phenomena"

reasonably expect this result, for the reason that when normal conditions prevail, that is, when the objective mind is in control, and a stimulus is applied to an extremity, say the foot, it requires a measurable length of time for the afferent nerves to convey the message to the brain, and then for the efferent nerves to convey a return message to the extremity, suggesting its removal from the source of irritation. It is reasonable to suppose, therefore, that if the subjective mind is in control, and if it pervades the whole body, the message would reach the seat of control in less time than it takes to send a message through one set of nerves from the foot to the brain and to receive a reply from the brain to the foot through another set of nerves.

Accordingly, we find, from the experiments of Professor G. Stanley Hall and others, that the time limit of reaction in a hypnotized subject is decreased nearly one half as compared with that of the same subject in a normal condition. I am not unaware of the fact that Professor James, of Harvard, and some others, have tried the same experiment with negative results. But a negative result possesses no evidential value whatever when it is confronted with positive results such as those of Professor Hall. A thousand unsuccessful experiments prove nothing when they are offset by one successful experiment. I do not, however, regard this difference in the time of reaction as by any means conclusive; but it is a factor in the problem which is entitled to consideration; for it is one of the series of phenomena that we might expect to find, if the hypothesis is correct, that the soul is immanent in the

whole body, and not localized or inherent in any part of it.

Aside from the surgical experiments mentioned, however, some of the strongest proofs of the truth of this hypothesis are found in the phenomena immediately preceding the death of the body and in the phenomena of hypnotism

When death approaches, we find the observable phenomena to be precisely what we should have a right to expect if it is true that the soul of man is immortal, and that it is therefore immanent, and not inherent, in the body. We also find that the objective mind, on the approach of death, exhibits precisely the phenomena which we should have a right to anticipate if it is true that it is inherent in the brain, and consequently perishes with that organ

The respective phenomena of the two minds, then exhibited, are simply these —

The objective mind, in exact proportion to the growing weakness of the physical organism, ceases to perform its functions in perfection, and it is generally, if not always, completely obliterated before final dissolution takes place. Materialistic scientists have taken great pains to demonstrate this fact, because it is demonstrative that the mind (objective) is dependent upon a physical organism for its existence; and as that class of scientists know of no other mind than that of which the brain is the organ, they easily and logically decide that man is not destined to a future life. We may therefore accept their facts, but not their conclusions; although it must be said, in all candor, that

if the brain is the organ of all that constitutes the intelligence of man, their conclusions are legitimate and cannot be successfully refuted.

On the other hand, the phenomenal manifestations of the subjective mind become more and more pronounced as death approaches and the body grows feeble; and its strongest manifestations are made in the very hour of dissolution. This fact is attested by all the records of psychic manifestations, including those of the Society for Psychical Research.¹ Many instances are recorded of most wonderful psychic manifestations, at the hour of death, by persons who had never before possessed any phenomenal psychic power whatever. The publications of the Society for Psychical Research abound in well-authenticated instances where telepathic messages were sent to distant friends, at the hour of death, announcing the event and describing the tragic details.

It is, in fact, the ultimate phenomenal manifestation of the universal law of psychic activity that the more perfectly quiescent the brain becomes the stronger become the manifestations of the subjective mind. This, I repeat, is a universal law, beginning with the lightest stage or degree of hypnotic sleep and ending in ecstasis or in death. In the supreme hour, therefore, after the brain has forever ceased to perform its functions, and the objective mind is totally extinct, there is an interval before the soul takes its final departure in which it shines forth with phenomenal lustre, to give assurance to the world that the death of the body is

¹ See "Phantasms of the Living"

but the birth of the soul into a higher and a more perfect life.

This phenomenon is a part of almost every death-bed scene, although it is comparatively rare that it is so strikingly manifested as to attract attention. It is well known to almost every one who is familiar with the phenomena of death, that, just previous to final dissolution, the mind of the patient suddenly brightens, pain ceases, and other symptoms of convalescence often supervene to such an extent that the friends are filled with renewed hope. The experienced physician knows, however, how illusive are such hopes and how soon they are to be blasted. The psychologist knows that the supreme moment has arrived, that the brain has forever ceased its functions, and that the mind of the immortal part of man has phenomenally demonstrated its potential energy, — its independence of bodily conditions.

One of the most striking exhibitions of this phenomenon that have ever come under my notice was witnessed at the death-bed of ex-Governor Claude Matthews, of Indiana, in 1898, and I cannot more appropriately close this part of my argument than by relating the circumstance.

On August 29, 1898, the morning papers contained the following Associated Press report, which is as concise and intelligent as it is possible to make it; and it is therefore reproduced entire. —

“Wingate, Ind., Aug. 28. — At 6 30 o'clock this morning at the quiet Meharry homestead, where he was taken immediately after his sudden affliction, ex-Gov. Claude Matthews passed away peacefully, surrounded by his wife and all the other members of his immediate family.

"There was prayer service, accompanied by the singing of hymns, at the bedside of the dying ex-Governor. Mrs. Matthews was very much affected, and stated that she would give anything in the world if her husband would manifest by a single word his faith in Jesus. About three o'clock the minister in the course of the services asked the dying man if he believed in Jesus. The answer, as plainly as any one could articulate it, was 'Yes'. The three physicians regarded this answer as remarkable, as all agreed that the particular part of the brain affected by the paralysis was that governing speech, and that the ex-Governor would probably never have talked had he lived. It was the only word he spoke after he was stricken. He immediately lapsed into a profound coma, from which he did not recover before he passed away at 6 30 o'clock."

Immediately upon the publication of this report, I addressed a letter of inquiry to one of the physicians in attendance upon the distinguished patient, Dr. Olin, but as he did not happen to be present at the time the event occurred, he turned the letter over to Dr. F. D. Allhands, who very kindly replied as follows —

Office of F. D. ALLHANDS, Physician and Surgeon,
WINGATE, IND., Sept 14, 1898

DEAR MR HUDSON, — Your letter was handed to me by Dr. Olin. He was not present at the time of the death of Mr. Matthews. Dr. R. French Stone, of Indianapolis, and I were present. He [Governor Matthews] did speak the word "Yes" *very* distinctly, so as all in the room could hear and understand him. The part of the brain that governs speech was undoubtedly affected, that was the opinion of all the physicians. I see no objection to your using my name.

Yours truly,

F. D. ALLHANDS.

The evidential value of this case can hardly be overestimated if the diagnosis of the physicians was correct, and it is difficult to imagine how they could be mistaken. The hypothesis we have been considering, however, affords an easy explanation of the phenomenon. The cortical area controlling the organs of speech was paralyzed, and in all human probability the whole brain had ceased its functions at the time when the event happened. The subjective mind was, therefore, active and in control. The brain action being inhibited, the subjective mind was amenable to control by suggestion, unhampered by any possible adverse auto-suggestion. Every thing, in fact, conspired to bring about the result. The supreme moment in the life of the dying man had arrived. The overwhelming desire of the stricken wife to know if he had faith in Jesus had been expressed. The religious training of his youth had taught him that a confession of trust in Christ was essential to salvation. The clergyman's question, uttered in a tone of solemn earnestness, and addressed directly to the patient, constituted the strongest conceivable suggestion that an answer was not only possible, but was expected. In pursuance of that suggestion the subjective mind of the dying man answered the question.

In doing so, it simply exercised that control over the functions of the body which, as we have already seen, it normally exercises in all cases of emergency, especially when the action of the brain is, from any cause, inhibited.

The most prolific source of evidence of the correctness of the hypothesis, however, is found in the

phenomena of experimental hypnotism, especially that of amnesia subsequent to the induction of a state of profound hypnosis. Every student of the phenomena of cerebral activity is aware that all our normal mental experiences are registered in the brain. That is to say, every thought or experience of normal consciousness produces a corresponding modification of brain cells. New cells are created and old cells are modified, and these constitute the physical receptacles of memories of brain thought and experience. Every hypnotist knows that a profoundly hypnotized subject does not remember what takes place during the time of deep hypnosis, no matter how exciting and impressive may be the scenes in which he has been made to figure in pursuance of the suggestions of the hypnotist. The obvious explanation is that the action of the brain is inhibited during deep hypnosis, and hence there is, and can be, no change in the brain cells to correspond to the thoughts and experiences of the subjective mind.

The phenomena of spontaneous somnambulism are exactly parallel, and the explanation is the same. On the other hand, in a state of partial hypnosis the subject will often remember the details of his subjective thoughts and hallucinations, and the memory will be vivid in exact inverse proportion to the depth of the hypnosis. The phenomena of dreams during natural sleep are precisely the same. We remember those dreams only which come to us when we are just between sleeping and waking—before the brain ceases to act, as we are going to sleep, or after it is partially roused to activity as we are awakening. All